HSÜ CHIH-MO 徐志摩 A LITERARY BIOGRAPHY

Ph. D. Thesis

Submitted

by

GAYLORD KAI-LOH LEUNG

1972

ABSTRACT

This paper attempts to give a relatively accurate picture of Hsü Chih-mo's life with emphasis on the literary side as the title suggests. A generally chronological order is observed throughout the discussion. Chapter one covers the first period of Hsü's life, stressing his Cambridge days. Chapter two gives an account of Hsü's love life, literary works and activities in the first two to three years after he returned to Peking from abroad in 1922. Chapter three is a continuation of the previous one, up to the year 1926. Chapter four deals with Hsü's last years in Shanghai, with a special note on his disillusionment with love and life, and the final "revival" shortly before his death.

Hsü is treated primarily as a poet rather than an essayist in this paper and his poetical works are examined separately in the relevant sections, i.e., chapters two, three and four. Some incidents and activities in Hsü's life are investigated in greater detail than others with a view to either (1): correcting erroneous or inaccurate impressions which have almost been perpetuated in both journalistic writings and even scholarly works concerning Hsü, or (2): demonstrating facts hitherto little known to the world so as to illustrate some important points which would otherwise remain unclear.

Quite a number of Hsü's poems and articles, long forgotten or practically unknown because they have not been included in any of his collections, have been exhumed, and dozens of unpublished letters by him have been used in this biography.

CONTENTS

Chapter three

Chapter four

INTRODUCTION

When the student of history of modern Chinese literature compares, for instance, the accounts about Lu Hsün (魯迅) rendered by Su Hsüeh-lin (蘇雪林) and Huang Sung-k'ang (黃松康) respectively, [1] he will have a first idea of the hazards he may be faced with in his work. Indeed, China during the republican period was undergoing such political upheavals that almost everything was somewhat coloured by politics; literature and literary history were no exceptions. The situation was made more complicated in terms of academic research since before the western world paid due attention to modern Chinese literature in the fifties, serious scholarly study of this subject was not carried out systematically by individuals or university people in China, and books and articles relating to this field were in nature mostly journalistic and polemic, and sometimes just fictional. Misinformation, factual errors, intentional distortion of truth and unintentional misprint were the unpleasant features frequently found in these writings.

I did not think modern Chinese literature was a thorny subject before I started to study Hsü Chih-mo at the University of British Columbia, Canada, in 1967. Coming to London two years later, I continued my research and, though sometimes baffled by a number of contradictory "facts" unearthed as I got deeper into the subject, benefited from the fairly large collection of Chinese books and periodicals of the republican period in the Library of the School of Oriental and African Studies. With the progress of time, my work extended outside London and Great Britain.

My visits to North America and the Far East, in addition to several trips in England, were all fruitful. My interviews and correspondence with over twenty people helped me to gain a clearer insight into my subject.

I am especially thankful to my supervisor Dr. D. E. Pollard of S.O.A.S. His suggestions, advice, patience and urbanity are unforgettable. During his absence from England in 1970-71, Dr. K. P. K. Whitaker supervised my work; I am indebted to her for many encouragements and kindnesses. My grateful thanks are due to the Canada Council for a Doctoral Fellowship; without such generous financial assistance I would not have been able to do my research in England or elsewhere. I was fortunate enough to get acquainted with Mr. L. K. Elmhirst in London. He not only permitted me to "ransack" every relevant file in his Records Office but also showed me all the relics connected with his friendship with Hsü Chih-mo. During my brief stay in Dartington Hall, Devon, I enjoyed his hospitality and anecdotes of Hsü and Tagore. To him I am deeply obliged. Many other individuals and institutions, whose names are gratefully recorded in the relevant notes in this thesis, gave me, or helped me to procure, access to unpublished materials such as letters and records of Hsü Chih-mo, and also to some rare items like Ch'en-pao fu-k'an (晨報副刊) (Supplement to the Peking Morning Post); the first edition of Chih-mo ti shih (志摩的詩) (Chih-mo's Poems), etc. These "treasures", I hope, will add value to this work which seeks to give a relatively accurate picture of Hsü as a poet and literary "activist", and above all, as a man who is not, as sometimes portrayed, a devil, an Ariel, or an angel, but one who eats, drinks, works, sleeps, loves and hates just like

any other human being.

In the following pages, comparatively more detailed discussion is devoted to hitherto unknown facts with a view to adding new dimensions to the understanding of Hsü, and also to removing uncertainties or errors; what is general knowledge of the present subject occupies only an inferior place. No attempt is made to present an elaborate account of Hsü's prose writings because as a biography submitted in the form of a thesis, this work must not be made unduly long; and, after all, as mentioned above, Hsü Chih-mo is primarily a poet and literary "activist".

Apart from a few articles dealing with some features of Hsü's works, and a forthcoming book on some of his poetry, (2) Hsü Chih-mo, albeit one of the major figures in modern Chinese literature, has not been seriously and adequately studied in or outside China. Generally, his image is rather blurred. It is hoped that the present work, with its original findings, will help, in a way at least, to form some "contribution to the knowledge of the subject".

NOTES

1. E.g., according to Su, Lu Hsün left quite a fortune to his family; but Huang said Lu Hsün died "in extreme poverty". See Su, Wo lun Lu Hsün , p. 87; Huang, Lu Hsün and the New Culture Movement of Modern China, p. 134.

2. This book is expected from Prof. Cyril Birch of University of California, Berkeley, U.S.A.

CHAPTER ONE

A. Before the baptism of the west.

The birth of a son on 15th January, 1897 [1] made the winter a spring to Hsü Shen-ju (徐申如) of Hsia-shih (硤石), Chekiang (浙江) province. Hsü, although not a revolutionary in the strict sense,[2] was a man with "new thought" in his time, being aware of the importance of modern industry and banking in a country. He hoped that his already thriving banking business would be even more prosperous in future when the baby grew up to be his successor. Although he respected literature as all his fellow countrymen did, he would resent the idea of educating his son to become a man of letters. However, his only child eventually turned out to be anything but a banker.[3]

But there was little indication in his youth that Hsü Chih-mo (徐志摩) would defy his father's wish. He was apparently a filial son and was conscious of the future career his father had designed for him. As to his excellent performance at school, this would only have convinced the older man that his son would become a first-class professional man in due course.

Some people are of the opinion that Hsü's engrossment in reading novels at school was the earliest sign of his love for literature.[4] Whereas this may well be true, it must at the same time be noted that Hsü was at an early age exposed to the influence of Liang Ch'i-ch'ao (梁啟超) (1873-1929) whose writings for people of Hsü's generation had a magical power to sweep them along with him, and Hsü's interest in novels may have been the result of Liang's celebrated essay "Lun hsiao-shuo yü ch'ün-chih chih kuan-hsi" (論小說與羣治之關係) (On the relationship between fiction and the guiding of the people).[5] In other words, Hsü's novel-reading was not a mere pursuit of

literature but a mixed, if not pure, interest in social and political questions. This argument is borne out by Hsü's representative school essays which were social, political and historical rather than literary in content;(6) and the one appearing in his school magazine as his first publication: "Lun hsiao-shuo yü she-hui chih kuan-hsi" (論小說與社會之關係) (On the relationship of fiction and society) was an echo of Liang's essay mentioned above, both in content and in style. The young Chih-mo would not have dreamed of choosing letters for his life-long career.(7)

As to the literary standard of his school essays, it would seem very high indeed for a teenager; but one must not overlook the fact that these essays must have been to a certain extent corrected and polished by the school master concerned and were therefore not the original products. This is no disparagement of Hsü, for a few years later, his letter to Liang Ch'i-ch'ao and another one to his relatives and friends are evidence of his fundamentally sound training in classical Chinese language and literature.(8) However, what arrests our attention in the latter epistle is not only its elegant classical Chinese but its writer's anxiety about the degeneration of morality, the fate of China, his rebuke of the government, and his exhortation to himself and to the young people at large - all these passionately argued themes are linked to the central one of patriotism. On this letter Liang Shih-ch'iu (梁實秋) (1902-) had some apt comments:

> This was the state of mind of the young Hsü Chih-mo as he was leaving China for the first time. Overflowing was his patriotism. Liang Ch'i-ch'ao's influence can be seen both in style and in thought.(9)

Indeed, Hsü after spending over three years in three institutions as a university student[10] was introduced to Liang Ch'i-ch'ao by his brother-in-law Chang Chün-mai (張君勱),[11] and was formally accepted as a ti- tzu (弟子) (student and disciple) by Liang. The initiative of this event must have been taken by Hsü himself who had been a worshipper of Liang since his teens. This took place shortly before Hsü left for America in summer, 1918.[12] The fact that Liang to him was more or less a god at that time can be appreciated from his letter to the master when he was on his way to America:

> In summer I had the honour of being presented to you and was quite dazed by your erudition ... On the day of departure, I was privileged to hear your golden exhortation, and even a small word from you was shining with enlightenment. This moved and rejoiced me to such a degree that I could not but shed tears. Thinking of how you, my master, teach others by your own virtues yet nevertheless have accepted me despite my unworthiness, I feel nervous, fearing that just as a wild horse can not be chosen for the use of the king, I might not be able to live up to the standard of a sage's disciple, and thus be put to shame. [Being aware of this danger], how can I not strive to do my best so as to prepare myself for shouldering great tasks in future days? [13]

Inspired by his mentor, Hsü put a heavy political commitment on himself and was determined to serve his country by what he was going to learn abroad. He visualized himself fully equipped with the most up-to-date knowledge of economics in a few years' time, and upon his return to China, he would be the first man to clear up the chaos in the state economics and finance and create order, stability and prosperity. Indeed, his ambition was "to become a Chinese Alexander Hamilton".[14] To encourage himself and to demonstrate his determination when he was about to start on his journey, he adopted the English name "Hamilton"; and in

Chinese, he began calling himself "Chih-mo" (meaning possibly intending to do everything for the benefit of mankind and wearing himself out thereby),[15] which superseded the original name "Chang-hsü" (章垿). His lofty aspiration, however, can be viewed as the first mild clash with his father's expectations; for Hsü Shen-ju considered his son's further education abroad to be the preparation for the young man to enter the banking business.[16] The older Hsü was concerned for the family, the younger Hsü, for the nation. It goes without saying that Hsü Chih-mo would have despised himself if he had shared his father's hope without reservation. A young man worthy of the name of Liang Ch'i-ch'ao's disciple should look beyond his family and family business, however prosperous it was and could be. To rejuvenize China, to help her stand on her own feet, strong and vigorous, was all that mattered. Hsü Shen-ju apparently did not quite realize the "generation gap" between himself and his son. And as long as he was assured that the young man was to study economics and banking, there was no reason why he should worry himself. As to the blazingly patriotic farewell letter of Chih-mo to his friends and relatives,[17] he would just have looked on his son's attainment in classical Chinese with due pride and satisfaction, and dismissed the other elements as a mere fashion of the day, from which few educated young people were immune, and which most would outgrow at a later time.

B. In America.

Arriving in America in September, 1918, Hsü entered Clark College (now Clark University). His life there was that of a fervent patriot and had, quite properly, a military discipline. The kind of time-table he and his Chinese room-mates kept to can be seen from the following example:

> Up at six. At seven, held a morning meeting in remembrance of the humiliation China had suffered. Sang the national anthem in the evening. Went to bed at half past ten. During the daytime, studied hard; and besides, did exercise, practised running and read newspapers. (18)

Even this rigourous life was hardly enough to gratify these patriotic souls; he and his room-mate Li Chi (李濟)(19) took the trouble of visiting Harvard to register themselves in a Chinese students' Kuo-fang hui (國防會) (National Defence Society) in late 1918 or early 1919. There Hsü became acquainted with Wu Mi (吳宓). These young zealots talked "extensively" about current affairs, about diplomacy, and about politics. They met one another several times afterwards, and their topics of conversations were invariably these same three! (20)

When Hsü graduated in 1919, he achieved first class honours in the Department of History.(21) Then he registered at Columbia University for an M.A. course in the Department of Economics, Faculty of Political Science.(22)

In America Hsü was not only a hard-working student but an untiring "activist" among his fellow Chinese students.(23) His sociability and personal warmth won him many friends.

According to Hsü, the reading of Ruskin and Marx at Columbia shook his faith in modern industry, and the further reading of some social novels nourished even more

hatred in his heart towards all big chimneys, the symbols of all industries. His disgust with modern civilization and capitalism was growing and this switched him to socialism, at first to the particular type as advocated by Robert Owen (1771-1858), the British reformer and socialist. Starting from Owen he developed an interest in Soviet Russia and because of this, he earned the nickname of "Bolshevik" from his Chinese friends. He surely considered himself a radical.(24)

After obtaining his M.A. at Columbia in 1920, Hsü Chih-mo, instead of continuing his work for Ph.D., decided to go to England. This vital decision of his proved to be of paramount importance in his life. A few years later he wrote about his objective thus:

> I went to England in order to follow Russell ... I crossed the Atlantic, intending to do some serious studies under the Voltaire of the twentieth century.(25)

Obviously he was still pursuing a socio-political career.

Although it is clear that he had read some Russell in America before he bade farewell to the "hateful" statue of Liberty,(26) he never hinted how much he read. Judging from his sentiments expressed in New York and the publication dates of Russell's works around that period, we can safely say that whereas Introduction to Mathematical Philosophy (1919) would not have bothered him, items like Principles of Social Reconstruction (1916), Political Ideals (1917) and Roads to Freedom (1918) must have been included in his reading list. Russell's attack on hypocrisy, capitalism and commercialism; his promotion of an international government for the maintenance of peace; his defence of creative impulses; his love for mankind and for civilization; and his

integrity, bravery and candour would not have failed to appeal grippingly to a young man like Hsü who was by nature inclined to emotionalism, freedom, peace and justice. Russell's being imprisoned by the British government would only have excited his admiration for the dauntless philosopher.

But simultaneously another influence, no less strong than Russell's, shared the dominance of Hsü's mind. It was Nietzsche's. Whether Hsü was first attracted by Nietzsche or by Russell is not known; however, he did not abandon the former in order to embrace the latter even if Nietzsche had been the first inspiration. Hsü's own words are: "The time when I ... crossed the Atlantic, I was enthralled by Nietzsche."(27)

The fact that Russell and Nietzsche maintained, as it were, a kind of co-existence in Hsü in 1920 convinces us that Hsü accepted the German philosopher as a brave warrior against corrupt traditions and also as a prophet breathing uplifting messages that helped people to live, if "dangerously", gloriously. Hsü certainly did not treat Nietzsche as a devilish anti-democratic maniac as some people did, although a few years afterwards he reversed his position, or rather he claimed that he had reversed his position, and called Nietzsche's teachings "the blood-stained words".(28) Nevertheless, so long as he interpreted Nietzsche as he did in 1920, he would have felt no need to deport the Superman from the kingdom of his mind. Actually he could well derive courage and power from Nietzsche to equip himself for his pilgrimage to England - to seek a higher goal and fight a better fight in life.

C. In London.

In the essay that states the motive of his journey to England, Hsü started with the following sentence: "In all the turning points of my life, there are threads of emotion which can often be found." (29) How strongly Russell's utterances like "Obedience to the impulses is very unlikely to do much harm, and may well do great good "(30) and "... impulse has more effect than conscious purpose in moulding men's lives " (31) acted on him is not easy to estimate, but the fact that his setting sail for England was prompted by impulse is obvious in that before leaving New York, he did not make any contact with Russell himself or the University of Cambridge or any other institutions; and worst of all, he did not even know that Russell had already been deprived of his fellowship by Trinity College in as early as 1916 and would not return though reinstated some time after the war. (32) Hsü was, as it were, dreaming his way to Europe, and did not wake to cold reality till he touched the English soil. Actually Russell was not even in England when he arrived.(33)

Disappointed, Hsü nevertheless applied to the London School of Economics and Political Science (L.S.E.) for admission to do his Ph.D. in the field of political science under Harold Laski.(34) He quickly adapted himself to the new environment in London, and this was stated in a letter written in November to his father:

> Since my arrival in London, my spirit has entered a new phase of development and my interest in study has become keener. Why should not my success start from here? I especially enjoy making friends with the English men of fame; benefit derived from their acquaintance is manifold ... When I first arrived in America, I realized that my previous education was all

> out of date; and when I came to New York, I felt that the first year seemed to have been spent in vain. Now I have come to regret last year's emptimess. The latter part of this year is likely to bring forth a new stage of progress. It is something to be happy about! The London weather is not too bad, and only material comfort is not so well provided for as it was in America ... but I feel quite all right. (35)

Evidently Hsü's first disappointment in England was only transient; and once at L.S.E., he was happy and content. And he was active, too. One early morning, apparently desiring to gain some practical experience in politics, he helped his supervisor's wife, Mrs. Laski, to canvass in the constituency of Woolwich.(36) However, in his essay "Wo so chih-tao ti K'ang-ch'iao" (我所知道的康橋) (The Cambridge I Know), he registered his "boredom" at the School and his anxiety to work out a change. What lies behind this sudden shift of ground is mysterious. A few facts, however, can be considered as relevant:

First, Hsü made friends with Ch'en Yüan (陳源) (1895-1970) soon after his arrival in London and then he was introduced by Ch'en to H. G. Wells who later invited Hsü to his country house.(37) There the host and the guest talked for long hours about modern fiction, and Wells encouraged Hsü to translate some Chinese novels for publication in England. They had a wonderful time together and became good friends.(38) In this connection Wells seemed to have been the first person to kindle Hsü's interest in literature and thus to some extent lured him away from his academic studies at L.S.E.

Secondly, it is not clear who exactly those "Ying-kuo ming-shih" (英國名士) (English men of fame), as mentioned by Hsü in a letter to his father, were, though H. G. Wells must have been one of them.(39) If, in addition to Wells, Hsü made the acquaintance of Laurence Binyon and

Arthur Waley (1889-1966) in the first few months in London, which was very likely,[40] then he would have been moving in a circle whose influence was indisputably on the side of art and literature.

Thirdly, in "Shang shuang-kua lao-jen" (傷雙栝老人)(In Memory of Mr. Lin Ch'ang-min), Hsü recalled his first meeting with Lin Ch'ang-min (林長民) (1876-1925) in London, writing:

> At the very beginning when I was struck by your remarkable features and by your even more remarkable talking, I did not endorse your interests in politics. Many a time I hinted at the desirability of your reversing your course while there was still time, hoping that you could assume the spiritual leadership in this new era, and we could break new ground in art and literature.[41]

Hsü met Lin before he entered Cambridge, or in other words, when he was still at L.S.E., and the above quotation referring to that period already shows his interest in literature. And indeed, though a much older man than Hsü, Lin was both romantic and young at heart, and subsequently these two men engaged themselves in the literary pastime of writing love letters to each other, pretending to be unhappy lovers who had been barred by social conventions from realizing their happiness in a free marriage.[42]

Fourthly, Lin Ch'ang-min was accompanied by his daughter Lin Hui-yin (林徽音), or Phyllis Lin,(1904-194 ?) in England.[43] The latter, a pretty young lady of sixteen, captured Hsü's fancy at first sight; Hsü fell in love in no time.[44] As Love usually demands time for visiting, chatting, scheming, entertaining, worrying, day-dreaming, etc, etc., the six courses at L.S.E. would have seemed an intolerable burden. Later when Lin Hui-yin

went to Edinburgh to attend a school, London would no longer have been a delightful city.(45)

All these facts may have constributed to Hsü's "boredom", a word which likely concealed a state of psychological distress. But his release was soon at hand: through Lin Ch'ang-min at a League of Nations Union meeting he became acquainted with Goldsworthy Lowes Dickinson (1862-1932), a fellow of King's College, Cambridge who, believing himself to be originally a "Chinaman", was ever ready to help the Chinese.(46) Having diagnosed the "illness" of his young friend, he at once prescribed Cambridge. After some formality, Hsü found himself at King's College by February, 1921,(47) happily attending some lectures - all this being through Dickinson's recommendation and support. But official admission as an advanced student was not granted to Hsü till 5th October, and though he had an M.A. from Columbia, he was treated as a B.A. from L.S.E.(48) Anyway, this did not bother him at all. A new chapter in his life had begun.

D. In Cambridge.

1. Love and divorce.

So our poet was going to find his voice in Cambridge, and his own account of his conversion from political science to literature was given as follows:

> Ten full years ago [1921] I came across a strange wind, or was shone on by some strange moonlight, and since then my thought has turned to the expression of words in lines. A profound melancholy finally overpowered me. This melancholy, I believe, even gradually permeated and transformed my temperament.(49)

These words are too symbolic to elucidate the fact. However, the "strange wind" was the very cause that made him a poet. Or perhaps we can say that the "strange wind", or the "strange moonlight", had implanted "a profound melancholy" in Hsü, and this "melancholy" had "permeated and transformed" him to such a degree that he eventually could do nothing but write poetry.

To trace Hsü's literary and intellectual development, it is necessary to look more closely into this "strange wind" which deprived China of an Alexander Hamilton but compensated her with a poet and essayist. This "wind", after all, was composed of several elements; an attempt is made in the following paragraphs to analyze them.

Undoubtedly the vortex of the "strange wind" that blew out political science and blew in literature, or more specifically, poetry, was Hsü Chih-mo's love affair with Lin Hui-yin. To deal with this half mystery,(50) we should start from Hsü's marriage in 1915 when he was a first-year student at Shanghai Baptist College and Theological Seminary.

His wife, Chang Yu-i (張幼儀) (1900-), a practical young woman of many qualities, was of a prominent family in Kiangsu (江蘇) province. The marriage, though in theory an arranged one, was by no means forced on Hsü, and proved to be a happy union until divorce shattered it in 1922. There is evidence that Hsü did love his wife. Away from home, he longed for her; and shortly after his arrival in London, he succeeded in persuading his father to let her come to live with him in England.(51) But when she joined him early in 1921,(52) he was already desperately in love with Lin Hui-yin. His feelings, at the time Chang Yu-i arrived in Britain, must have been confusingly complicated.

During the first few months in Cambridge, he lived with his wife in Sawston, and carried on a secret correspondence with his girl friend.(53) He was leading more or less a double life, which was satuated with sweetness and pain. Melancholy was inescapable, and it was this very melancholy which weighed so heavily in him that he had to unburden it by some means. And indeed, in literary Cambridge, what could be a better outlet than poetry?

But problems persisted. However, a man like Hsü was not prepared to be gnawed from day to day by melancholy or to die an ignoble lingering death. The Russell in him would at this crucial time counsel him to obey impulses, and the Nietzsche in him would nerve him for fighting a way out. According to Ch'en Ts'ung-chou (陳從周), Lin Hui-yin would not think of marrying Hsü without his divorcing Chang Yu-i first.(54) This sounded logical and sensible, and so divorce was the short-cut to love's paradise. As to Hui-yin's father Lin Ch'ang-min, a middle-aged romantic, he should not be an obstacle. In fact Lin Ch'ang-min's inclination for free love and opposition to arranged marriage may have raised Hsü's hope considerably.(55) Hsü was determined to take action.

Divorce, however, required some sort of ground. Although Chang Yu-i was less beautiful and much less talented than Lin Hui-yin, yet homeliness and mediocrity could hardly be exploited for a cause of divorce. And even if Hsü did not mind following Russell's example of facilitating legal proceedings by having some "official adultery",(56) Lin Hui-yin was no Dora Black, and could scarcely be expected to comply. Hsü grew increasingly desperate. Finally and dramatically, he just left home and "hid" himself in London after declaring his intention of divorce. To cut a long story short, his wife was eventually compelled to leave England, pregnant with her second child, and broken-hearted.(57)

Having got rid of his wife, Hsü experienced a sense of emancipation. Now promises were high and his already intimate relations with Lin Hui-yin would be ensured of a new, rosy development - dreams going to become realities! How could he express the wonderful thrill of joy if not resorting to poetry? Thus he recorded his poetic experience in the first stage:

> In the first half year of writing poetry, my life was shaken by a great power, and all my ideas, half-mature or immature, were hurriedly transformed into verse. At that time I followed nothing, and cared for nothing. Whatever burdens I had in my heart were relieved indiscriminately through my pen. It was like saving a life, and no consideration was given to quality. I worte a great deal during a short period, but almost all of it was unpublishable.(58)

At that time he was like a former Kingsman, Rupert Brooke, who attested to "three things in the world" while in Cambridge, which were "to read poetry ... to write poetry ... to live poetry."(59)

It would seem that all the "ideas ... hurriedly transformed into verse" were his romantic melancholy; his tender feelings for Lin Hui-yin; his yearning and expectation of the consummation of his love affair and possibly also the anxiety about his father's wrath caused by his proposal of divorce. An occasional pang of conscience may have troubled him, but this he would not have written down for a permanent reminder to worry himself.

Most of Hsü's early verses have been lost, or destroyed on account of their immaturity; of course the word "unpublishable" may connote his very private love life which should not be exposed since the outcome was eventually a sad failure. But miraculously, a few of them, not intended for publication of course, came to light in 1969.(60) Of them "Ts'ao-shang ti lu-chu-erh" (草上的露珠兒) (The Dew-drops on the Grass) is the only one with an unmistakable date, i.e. 23rd November, 1921.(61) The poem sounds a note of optimism and conveys some counsel to poets, or rather the poet, Hsü himself. From it the reader can sense the joy of emancipation and creativity that is in consonance with Hsü's mood at that time. In addition to this there are five undated translations the language of which, either pure wen-yen (文言) (classical Chinese) or a mixed style of both wen-yen and pai-hua (白話) (modern spoken Chinese), denotes that they were done in England; another proof is the hand-writing by fountain pen.(62) Most of these translations either indulge in a thirst for love or demonstrate a passionate love. All this again is appropriate to Hsü's situation at that time, and his translations therefore speak for him through the mouths of other poets.

But the joy and sweetness of Hsü's emancipation did not last very long. Lin Hui-yin, following her father,

returned to China in autumn that year, and letters from his father were full of censures and threats.

It is beyond doubt that Hsü had some guilty feelings concerning the treatment of his wife, and this explains his reluctance to talk to her face to face once the subject of divorce had been initiated, and his subsequent "disappearance" from Cambridge.

After Chang Yu-i's departure from England, Hsü returned to Cambridge, and was busy searching for something to bolster his morale so that he could overcome all obstacles on his way to love's paradise. The most formidable barrier was his wife, for she did not really agree to a divorce. Hsü was in dire need of an exceptionally high cause to convince himself and her and others; he soon found it, thanks to the favour for free love among his western friends and especially the New Culture Movement at home that condemned all forms of arranged marriage. In his letter written in or shortly before March, 1922, he urged Chang Yu-i to comply with his request saying:

> True life must be won through struggle and a willing heart; true happiness must be won through struggle and a willing heart; and true love must also be won through struggle and a willing heart! Both of us have bright futures ... both of us want to reform society; both of us want to benefit mankind, and it is necessary that we should set examples ourselves, with courage and resolution and with mutual respect for each other's personality, to bring about a free divorce. For the end of pain and the beginning of happiness all depend on this.

And further:

> Freedom must be realized in freedom ... so that we can again discern the dawn of life, and [enter upon] a glorious career of permanent value ... And indeed, it is only a matter of seconds to change night into day, and hell into heaven. (63)

Hsü employed grandiloquence to flaunt the banner of a crusade against "loveless" arranged marriage, symbolic of opposition to all the Chinese traditional institutions many of which, according to him, were social and political evils. Championing individual freedom in terms of divorce, he claimed to be the liberator of himself and also of his wife who, by signing the divorce paper, would purchase redemption for Hsü and herself, and above all, would benefit mankind by setting a good example.

Noble and elevating it may seem, Hsü's letter does not appear to convey good sense though he had his own strange logic. According to him, true love could only be won "through struggle and a willing heart"; since he had not struggled at all to win Chang Yu-i, theirs was not true love. Secondly, he assumed that all who wanted to reform society, thus benefiting mankind, must set examples themselves, and since marriage was something urgently to be reformed, they must restore the original unmarried status so as to start all over again; the way leading back to the starting point was divorce. Finally, he stressed that the dissolution of an arranged marriage would establish the "victims" in "heaven" immediately. Such argument is shaky indeed. Few people would imagine that by divorce one can reform society and benefit mankind, or enter a utopia. Social problems can hardly be divorced from divorces as well as arranged marriages.

Evidently Hsü's justification of himself was lame. The "pure idealism", or "simple idealism" behind

which he shielded himself and before which some of his friends defended him was not quite pure nor was it simple.(64) It was at least at that time a pretext, for his "noble cause" did not precede but followed, or rather limped behind his action. In this respect at least, Hsü was a less sincere and therefore less estimable man than his old classmate and friend Yü Ta-fu (郁達夫) (1896-1945).(65) Yü after falling in love with Wang Ying-hsia (王映霞) did not resort to any noble cause or "ism" to justify himself. Instead of using big words, he told the world about his weakness, his susceptibility to feminine beauty, and his compunction when referring to his wife and children. Obviously he would have reckoned himself a worse sinner if he had tried to protect himself from the condemnation of society by uttering something like the grand expressions in Hsü's letter to his wife.(66) Among the modern Chinese men of letters, Lu Hsün (魯迅) (1881-1936) and Kuo Mo-jo (郭沫若) (1892-), like Yü Ta-fu, also practically though not legally divorced their wives,(67) but they refrained from exploiting any noble cause for justification. Hsü's friend Wu Mi, "the lovable book-worm",(68) made it very clear that he divorced his wife simply because he was desperately in love with another woman. His humble justification was only a short epigram: "morality is genuine feeling". His logic was very simple: he loved a more pretty and more talented woman, hence no more love for his wife, hence divorce.(69) Wu was as frank as Yü Ta-fu. From these cases we may conclude that Hsü's action was rather exceptional. Perhaps we might attribute it to his having been a student of political science since most politicians, and would-be politicians as well, are wont to justify what they do more readily and eloquently than many other people; besides, although he was not going to become an Alexander

Hamilton now, he was still a disciple of Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, and would have hated not to live up to such an image. Further, the Nietzsche in him could not have been fully satisfied unless all his actions could assume some lustre of nobility or revelation. However, the plain truth remains that neither his nor his friends' justification of his action is acceptable in the last analysis though it may have convinced Hsü himself. In fact his demand for a divorce simply because of the beauty and talents of an attractive girl; his desertion of his pregnant wife in a foreign land; his further proposal of abortion to his wife concerning the unborn child in a time when abortion was still a highly dangerous operation;(70) all this could hardly be varnished by any "idealism" or any other "ism".

Hsü may or may not have been acutely aware of the heedless passion and cruelty in him since people in love are generally sensible of some things and insensible of others; in relation to this point Wen Yüan-ning (溫源寧), a Cambridge contemporary and a candid friend, had something apt to say: "Chih-mo could sometimes be cruel and lacking in sympathy without himself knowing it." (71) Knowing it or not knowing it, he was already dyed in the Nietzschean colour and , having set his course, he would brush everything aside and pursue it to the end, however stormy the progress to the end was, and however bitter the end would be.

For enlightenment and reference in the matter of divorce, he made a point of reading Shelley and Shelley's life, (72) and the English romantic poet's deserting Harriet Westbrook for the intelligent and pretty Mary Wollstonecraft Godwin would naturally furnish him with a model and strengthen his faith in his own action and in search for his "soul's companion". (73)

Besides, Hsü wrote the Russells a letter on 3rd February, 1922; its urgent tone signified something personal and serious.(74) Judging from his subsequent move in March, i.e. the finalizing of his divorce, he seemed to desire to seek advice from the Russells before he got in touch with Chang Yu-i. Granted this background to his communication with the Russells at that time, Hsü could have sought support from them, expecting they would more readily than others sanction the dissolution of a "loveless" marriage and give their Chinese disciple every blessing for his enterprise.

To return to Hsü's letter to Chang Yu-i: its argument brought about the desired result. His wife finally agreed to a divorce. It seemed that the grandiloquence in the letter was not only a means of self-justification to Hsü himself but to Chang Yu-i a way out of defeat and a way to new dignity. In this light she was divorced only because her husband had to fight for a noble cause in order to benefit mankind. What she had to accept was just what a soldier's wife has to accept when her country is at war. The husband must go! There is greatness in addition to nobleness in the whole thing. So Chang Yu-i, like Hsü Ghih-mo, found comfort.(75) Then ensued the period of "collaboration" between them. They wrote to each other regularly and made it known to the world that after the divorce, they, being good friends, "fostered even more genuine feelings than ever before." (76) This puzzled the less sophisticated not a little; and even the savant Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, on learning it, felt somewhat stupefied. He wrote to Hsü:

> Previously I thought that you really could not get along with your wife ... so I refrained from commenting. But now I have heard that both of

> you carry on correspondence ... and you often commend her; then why the past action [i.e. the divorce] ? It is unconceivably mysterious indeed! (77)

Actually there was no mystery. Both Hsü and his wife (or now friend) simply helped to make life easier for each other. They bolstered up a noble image. They set a unique example. They tried to convince the world that they were reforming society. But the cost was great. The feeling of the burden of living and the relative unproductivity in his literary career in the last few years of Hsü's life were by and large due to the ebbing of his strength, physical and spiritual, spent on upholding his "idealism" which eventually could not but flag and wither.

2. Nature worship.

Recollecting his Cambridge life in 1922, Hsü wrote:

> In my whole life, that spring [in 1922] can be counted as not having been spent in vain ... though simultaneously it was also the period during which I felt the pain of life most acutely.(78)

We can take it that his "pain" was caused by the anxious hopes and fears in his love life. There was no sign of Lin Hui-yin's consenting to marry him even after Chang Yu-i had signed the divorce paper in Berlin, and Hui-yin was far, far away in China.

Life was vexing; but it still offered its comforts and its charms. From the autumn of 1921, Hsü started to discover Cambridge, but the spring of 1922 was especially

memorable. He became entirely enamoured of the natural beauty of the place, particularly of the River Cam. He declared himself a nature worshipper; and his nature worship was not merely due to the influence of Rousseau and other romantics but was itself a necessity imposed by the difficult situation facing him. Chang Yu-i, Lin Hui-yin, divorce, possible success, possible failure, parents, relatives ... worries abounded; and he needed peace and an anodyne. He found nature an infallible physician. A few years later when he came to write his reminiscences of Cambridge he said:

> From nature, we should obtain our continuous nourishment ... Health is for those who are in constant touch with nature ... In order to cure the present impasse in life, we need only the easy prescription: "Not to forget nature"...(79)

His "not to forget nature" was the only means by which he could forget the ugly reality. But nature, to be fair to Hsü, was indeed his source of inspiration.(80) His nature worship, moreover, was related to mysticism, which was overtly demonstrated in a poem entitled "Yeh" (夜) (Night) written in July, 1922.(81) Hsü could never forget the poetic inspiration Cambridge bestowed on him, nor can we leave unacknowledged some of the fine verse and prose written under her spell with which he had enriched modern Chinese literature.

3. Friends and friendship.

Perhaps stronger than the impact of nature on Hsü was the intellectual life the access to which Cambridge

provided for him. Truly, when he was still in London, however deeply involved in literary circles on account of his acquaintance with H. G. Wells and possibly others, he was not yet entirely committed to literature. Even if the seed of change had begun to germinate in London, the flowering did not come into being till he took up his residence in Cambridge.(82) The friendship with the English intellectuals he either established or strengthened in or through Cambridge had a tremendous meaning in his life, and it is worthwhile to look more closely into it.

G. L. Dickinson, after H. G. Wells, seemed to be among the first Englishmen who befriended Hsü. The adoration he won from his young Chinese friend was inevitable. It was not only because he loved China, wrote Letters from John Chinaman (1902) (which, curiously enough, was included in the bibliography of Hsü's M.A. thesis) and held a fellowship at King's College, Cambridge, but because he was a person who, being "beloved, affectionate, unselfish, intelligent, witty, charming, inspiring ...";(83) valued friendship with all people in the broadest sense.(84) E. M. Forster thus wrote about him: "What he cared for was love and truth. What he hoped for was a change in the human heart."(85) And this "hope for a change in the human heart" was echoed strongly by Hsü in both his poetry and prose. As to the advocating of the Hellenic life by him after his return to China,(86) the main influence could be from nobody if not Dickinson "[the] preacher of the Greek view of life ... and general instructor of youth".(87) In addition, Dickinson's passion for Shelley, Goethe and other great romantics, and his interest in politics and social reform were some of the intellectual assets Hsü inherited during his years in Cambridge.

Dickinson was no doubt a sort of English Liang

Ch'i-ch'ao to Hsü,[88] who asserted in a letter to Roger Fry (1866-1934) saying: "I have always thought it the greatest occasion in my life to meet Mr. Dickinson."[89] It was said that at King's the Chinese admirer used to hang about Dickinson's rooms and would even "sit in front of his door for hours".[90] It is not known whether he did that during Dickinson's presence or absence in Cambridge; in either case, such an act seemed rather odd but nevertheless understandable if it happened in the beginning of his Cambridge days. There may have been some comfort and even edification to be near the "Chinaman" 's rooms if not really in the man's physical presence.[91] His reverence for Dickinson was so deep that he brought back to China a fairly large-sized portrait of Dickinson either in 1922 or later.[92] Was he to hang it up for daily inspiration and worship? Perhaps. At any rate, that this was an act of affection and adoration is beyond dispute.

Lecturing on English literature after his return to China, Hsü told his students that "He [Dickinson] is the best friend of the Chinese",[93] and commenting on Letters from John Chinaman, he declared that "the beauty of the language in this book is unprecedented ... [The whole book] is like a living flowing stream."[94] For Dickinson's part, "when he was feeling the draught [in later years], which was often, he wore a little Chinese cap, the first of this series of caps was given him by his friend Hsü."[95]

Arthur Waley interpreted Hsü's coming to England as "[a] search for a Teacher in the Oriental sense."[96] Failing to become a student of Russell, Hsü got hold of Dickinson; but since Dickinson, at least in the first of Hsü's Cambridge years, was often in London or on the Continent, his "search", Waley said, came to an end.[97] But it would seem that the "search" then became one for a

collective Teacher - people to whom the seeker-student could attach some of his hero-worship sentiment. In this respect Hsü's achievement was considerable, for he did make a number of friends in and outside Cambridge.

It was through Dickinson that Hsü became acquainted with Roger Fry.(98) He admired this English artist; in a letter to him he poured out his adoration:

> [Your] large and sweet personality opened a new vision to me and has always been inspiring me to thoughts and feelings that are large, beautiful and noble. Need I say I have always wished that I could have seen more of you. What a pleasure, what a charm, what a comfort, to be just near you and hear your melodious voice!(99)

In the same letter, Hsü said emotionally that he was "overwhelmed" by Fry's "general sympathy" and was thankful for "the invaluable present" which, however, did not seem to be the portrait of Dickinson mentioned above but might have been two sketches by Fry.(100) As to the "generous sympathy", speculation would perhaps relate it to Hsü's divorce.

As far as Roger Fry is concerned, what drew him to Hsü appeared to be his interest in Chinese art and antiques,(101) and as for Hsü Chih-mo, the image of his collective Teacher would have been imperfect without an artist, and Roger Fry was the right man in that he abhorred any affectation of Bohemianism (102) and yet had a

> great capacity for laying himself open, trustfully, optimistically, completely to any new idea, new person or new experience that came his way.(103)

Surely the compliments heaped on him by Hsü were on the whole based on solid facts, though a little too heavily

charged with emotion.

Hsü paid quite a number of visits to Roger Fry in London.[104] In subsequent years, when he came to England for the second and third times, he never failed to call on this English artist and even stayed in his house.[105]

Hsü's "advertising" of Cézanne, Matisse and Piccasso after returning to China in 1922[106] was obviously due to the influence of Roger Fry whose zeal especially for the post-impressionists was contagious.

Hsü's friendship with Dickinson and Roger Fry became a bridge through which he made his pilgrimage to Millthorpe in Derbyshire where he paid his homage to Edward Carpenter (1844-1929).[107] He was apparently deeply impressed by the personality of the talented English writer and social reformer, but of course there were many other Carpenterian things which would have fascinated Hsü, for instance his unconventional approach to sex, marriage and divorce, his ideas about fredom, his call for a return to rural simplicity, his love for mankind, his interest in China, etc. It is interesting to note that Hsü's prose poems "Tu-yao" (毒藥) (Poison), "Pai-ch'i" (白旗) (White Flag) and "Ying-erh" (嬰兒) (Baby) and another poem "Tzu-jan yü jen-sheng" (自然與人生) (Nature and Life) do bear a strong resemblance to Carpenter's Whitmanesque long prose poem Towards Democracy (1883) both in content and technique. Carpenter, like Dickinson, seemed to be quite fond of Hsü, and maintained correspondence with him even after the latter returned to China.[108]

Kai-yu Hsu is the first scholar to mention the Bloomsbury group in relation to Hsü Chih-mo, but there does not seem to be any significant evidence that Hsü is indebted to them for "suggestions of the use of various

new images."[109] In addition to Roger Fry, Hsü could also claim some personal acquaintance with at least a couple of others of the group. Of all of them, he wrote on Maynard Keynes (1883-1946) most admiringly a few months after he returned to China:

> He [Keynes] is not only the foremost economist, not only an expert in statistics and logic, but, we can predict, a great statesman of the future.[110]

And also:

> If there is any clue to the reform of Europe, he [Keynes] must be one of those to shoulder the responsibility ... in short, the future of Keynes, in my opinion, is greater than anybody's in England.[111]

Additionally, Hsü reported that Keynes imparted to him in Cambridge the general idea of his daily time-table - only three hours for serious work; the remaining time for reading novels and chatting with friends.[112] This peculiar programme of a genius apparently impressed Hsü who seemed to model on the English economist on return to China when circumstances permitted him to do so.[113]

Hsü knew E. M. Forster[114] and quite possibly through Arthur Waley could have struck up an acquaintance with Lytton Strachey, who was Waley's next-door neighbour[115] and who enjoyed "the chiselled perfection of Chinese poetry",[116] and Clive Bell, one of Waley's best friends.[117] But there did not appear to exist any deep friendship between the Bloomsbury group, with the exception of Roger Fry, and Hsü, although he might have wished to know all of them and know them well.[118]

The Bloomsbury group is a very loose term - so loose that some people even doubt the justification for it.(119) However, those who frequented the Bloomsbury area and were thought, whether they liked it or not, to belong to the "group", did enjoy being together and were often together. They by no means held the same values of life or fought for any common cause on common grounds. They were in many ways different. The general stream in which all of them would agree to swim was one which had these currents: a contempt for anything that was conventional; a genuine interest in the pursuit of truth and beauty; and a love for arts, or the higher things in life, and for friendship based on mutual respect, honesty and tolerance.(120) All these would have undoubtedly appealed to Hsü, and therefore the influence the Bloomsbury group, as a group in the broadest sense, exerted on Hsü should be viewed in light of these trends which were apparently fostered by Hsü in his later literary activities in China.

Arthur Waley, a friend of the Bloomsbury group but not considered a member by all who wrote on it,(121) has been mentioned more than once in the previous pages. Obviously Hsü knew him very well. The tone of the letter written by Hsü and salvaged from Waley's literary remains manifests their cordial friendship.(122) It is likely that these two friends would have talked about classical Chinese poetry, especially that of the T'ang period, when they were together. But this is not the whole story. Hsü evidently imparted much up-to-date knowledge about Chinese cultural developments to Waley during and after his Cambridge days. Waley wrote about it thus:

> We already know a good deal about Chinese art and literature, and even something about the

> part they played in the life of the ancient Chinese. But very little was known here about the part such things played in the lives of cultured modern Chinese. That was what we learned from Hsü Chih-mo.(123)

Hsü's friendship with Waley deepened the latter's consciousness of the cultural relations between the east and the west and the importance of cultural exchange. He acknowledged the debt the west owed to Hsü saying, "I have spoken of Hsü as a Chinese influence on our own intellectual life in the post-war period."(124) These few words reveal a significant fact, or a significant dimension of the fact that Hsü in England not only received but also gave. He helped those who got in touch with him to see what modern China was really like, especially her cultural scene. Waley's remarks concerning Hsü have not received the attention they merit, and it is only appropriate to emphasize them here. Of all the western friends, Waley was the only person who wrote about Hsü Chih-mo in some detail and with true appreciation.(125)

Prof. I. A. Richards said in a letter that "Hsü was very widely admired and liked in Cambridge, a striking figure usually wearing Chinese dress."(126) Indeed, in the early twenties not a few people in the west, like Lytton Strachey, "had imagined China past and present as one long eighteenth century,"(127) and certainly there were not many Chinese in whom the Chinese and the English cultures had been happily combined. Hsü's appearance on the Cambridge scene was therefore welcomed. His personality, while western enough to facilitate anybody's approach, was after all not devoid of its easterm charms (not to mention his Chinese dress, scrolls of Chinese painting and calligraphy, etc.). (128) He knew how to amuse people,(129) and his facial expression, unlike that of some other Chinese students

studying abroad, was not that of "a Sphinx".[130] He was lively, curious, ardent, open-minded, eager to learn new things and to know new people - a big child in many ways. And above all, he possessed the unmatched quality of being able to "make a group come to life when he joined it - just by being there."[131] Even if there were no grounds for rating him high academically,[132] there was every reason for him to be everybody's friend.

According to Prof. Richards, Hsü was invited by him, C. K. Ogden and James Wood to take part in the activities of the Heretics, especially in reading and translating Chinese poetry.[133] When the three English friends were about to publish their joint work The Foundations of Aesthetics (1922) and were consulting people about the choice of a qualified man to adorn the front page of the book with two Chinese characters, i.e. Chung-yung (中庸) (equilibrium and harmony),[134] the unanimous reply was "Of course, Hsü! "[135] For, as Prof. Richards recollected, "Hsü already had considerable prestige" [136] in Cambridge at that time. And there Hsü knew the sinologist H. A. Giles, too. But their relationship is rather obscure, apart from the fact that Giles sent his translation of a poem by Hu Shih (胡適) to Hsü in 1924.[137]

There are still a few illustrious names in England connected with Hsü. The first is Bertrand Russell.

Although Hsü did not succeed in becoming Russell's student, he never gave up hope of seeing the philosopher face to face and learning from him even after the latter had gone to China. Having learned a lesson right after arriving England, he was now eagerly attentive to Russell's whereabouts. When the news of the philosopher's "death" reached Britain, Hsü wept and wrote an elegy[138] which, if not the very first, must be one of the first poems

written by him in England. Russell, however, lived; and prior to his return to London, Hsü already wrote him a letter imploring for an interview, which Russell was kind enough to grant.(139) After the first meeting, friendship sprang up between them and Hsü often took the trouble of going down to London for lectures given by the "modern Voltaire".(140)

When Russell's first child was born, Hsü arranged with other Chinese students to celebrate the happy occasion according to the Chinese custom - eating dyed eggs and noodles, and invited Russell and his wife to be their guests of honour.(141)

Before setting out on his homeward journey in 1922, Hsü, in Berlin, was still desirous of having a last word with the Russells.(142) Although they did not manage to see each other then, Russell sent him a copy of The Problem of China (1922); and according to Hsü, the English master asked him to propagate the message of the book among the Chinese.(143) When Hsü came to England for the second time in 1925 and for the last time in 1928, he made a special trip to Cornwall and Sussex respectively to see the Russells, chatting with them and enjoying their hospitality.(144) Unfortunately, although Hsü and Russell did continue to write to each other,(145) no letters to him can hardly have escaped the fate of loss or destruction in China. Russell, in old age, still remembered his Chinese friend and disciple; he jotted down a note, presumably in 1950's, about Hsü for historians and posterity. Part of it reads: "Mr. Hsü was a highly cultivated Chinese undergraduate, a poet both in English and Chinese ... Unfortunately, Mr. Hsü was killed on his way home to China."(146) This note, with its writer's high opinion of the man concerned, seems to indicate that the philosopher thought Hsü died in 1928, "on

his way home ..." This of course is wrong. However, although Russell's memory might have been at fault in the fifties, these two friends did appear to have lost touch with each other after Hsü's last visit to England.

Outwardly Russell played no direct role in shaping Hsü into a man of letters, but actually Russell's influence had helped to make Hsü what he was. Many of Hsü's political and social ideas expressed in his literary works can be traced back to Russell, and the upheavals of Hsü's life in terms of marriage and career which first took place in London and then in Cambridge owed their origin to his vital decision to come to England, which was prompted by none but the "Voltaire of the twentieth century".

Although Russell knew Katherine Mansfield (1888-1923), Hsü's visit to her had nothing to do with him but with J. Middleton Murry, with whom Hsü probably had been acquainted even before Russell returned from China. Murry introduced Hsü to Katherine Mansfield one night in mid-July, 1922, just a few weeks before Hsü left England for home.

Hsü proclaimed his meeting with Katherine Mansfield a most significant and unique event in his life. He wrote an essay about the occasion, praising the woman writer to such a degree that the reader would be led to believe that all beauties in the universe had been condensed into her single self, and other writers of her generation were but dim little stars huddled around her, the queen moon, who alone could shine with a pure light in the firmament of literature. She became his ideal beauty, just as Emilia Viviani was to Shelley. Everything about her assumed a celestial radiance. The "immortal twenty minutes" completely overwhelmed him and he felt himself being baptized into a heavenly bliss in her little bedroom.

This incited him to take up the responsibility of translating her short stories and interpreting them and their author to the Chinese audience afterwards. During the brief meeting, Katherine Mansfield advised her Chinese admirer not to enter into politics, for politics all over the world, she was reported to have said, was "just a mass of cruelty and crimes". Hsü cherished the advice as a sister's loving warning, quoting Byron's Lake Lemon verse in Childe Harold's Pilgrimage with all its associations of tantalizing and inscrutable love when he wrote about this rendezvous after his return to China.(147)

Though not quite so enraptured as that for Katherine Mansfield, Hsü's admiration for Bernard Shaw was also extreme. He reported that he heard the great wit several times in England.(148) He called him "the modern sage" and translated a number of the epigrams from "A Revolutionary's Handbook" attached to Shaw's play Man and Superman.(149) But Hsü did not seem to have been able to cultivate anything like friendship with Shaw; the latter perhaps simply did not think it worthwhile to befriend this Chinese young man who was merely a visionary university student, and a busy nobody.

Arthur Waley in an essay of his mentioned Hsü Chih-mo's visits to Joseph Conrad and Robert Bridges.(150) This was not written about by Hsü himself and it is not clear whether he made the visits during his Cambridge days or later. At any rate, he had a very high opinion of Conrad's novels and especially his short stories though he did not seem to have said anything about Bridges' poetry.(151)

4. Other aspects of intellectual life.

Being a sociable and lively young man, Hsü in Cambridge probably also took part in other club activities apart from those of the Heretics. He may have been, on account of his relations with Dickinson, active in the Cambridge branch of the League of Nations Union.(152) Other well-known organizations during that period in Cambridge included the Fabian Society, Query Club, Artists' Club, etc.(153) Lectures and talks and discussions were many. Outstanding persons like A. E. Housman, Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch and G. E. Moore were among the many speakers,(154) and several student magazines made their voices heard.(155) With all sorts of cultural activities going on throughout the year, how exciting life would have been to Hsü Chih-mo! Besides, he appeared to be as active as he had been before among Chinese students though they were small in number.(156)

Another aspect of Hsü's intellectual development is politics. Katherine Mansfield's advice(157) can be considered as respectfully and affectionately kept by Hsü throughout his life, though it was by no means the only factor determining his career; and the advice definitely did not, as nothing ever could, kill his interest in politics as an outsider. The birth of such an interest dated back to his teens; and on a more general level, is it not true that those Chinese traditionally nurtured in the Confucian classics are mostly politically-minded? Hsü Chih-mo had an unmistakable traditional background in spite of all his westernization and he, like his mentors Liang Ch'i-ch'ao and G. L. Dickinson, was a student of politics up to the end of his earthly days despite his adopting literature for his vocation in Cambridge. The general opinion of Hsü Chih-mo as a permanent resident of the ivory tower indulging in love, romantic

verse and decadence is inaccurate. One of the most well-known men of letters in the history of modern Chinese literature Mao Tun (茅盾) sagaciously observed: "He [Hsü] is a poet, but his political consciousness is very keen." (158)

In England, being first a student of Harold Laski and then a student at King's rather than, say Magdalene, and an admirer of Russell, Shaw, Wells, Carpenter and the like, Hsü was in terms of British politics a Labour man, as may be expected. In an essay of his he wrote:

> After my arrival in England, my sympathy with labour grew even stronger. Whenever I saw "labour" in the newspapers ... I at once stood on its side. At that time the people with whom I had the opportunity to associate myself were also supporters of the Labour party. Aristocrats, capitalists and the like were, when mentioned, objects of ridicule. Labour, what a sonorous word, and what a sacred word! Until I returned to China, I counted myself a radical, a socialist, even if not a Bolshevik.(159)

In England Hsü was moulded not only into a poet but also into a life-long supporter of British parliamentary democracy, and, consequently, averse to all political trends in China: the warlords' unprincipled politics, the Kuomintang's totalitalianism and the communists' dogmatism. The way the British, including the conservatives he held in contempt, conducted their political life: arguing in parliament, gossiping in back gardens or swearing in "pubs", fearlessly and candidly, elicited his whole-hearted admiration. He eulogized this system.(160) More space will be devoted to Hsü's political views as expressed in his works later in these pages, but here suffice it to say that England's influence on him in this particular aspect was no less important than Cambridge's literary impact.

Nobody seems to have written about the influence of the Literary Revolution Hsü felt when he was in the west; on the contrary, most people would think of only England and English poetry when dealing with Hsü's verse. To complete the picture of Hsü, China, the home scene, should be brought into focus now that much has been said about Chang Yu-i, Lin Hui-yin, London, Cambridge and friends and friendship. Wen Yüan-ning, a friend of Hsü's at King's College, was reported to have said that Hsü was quite ignorant of the Chinese political and social situation and did not even know who Hu Shih was when first entering Cambridge.(161) Such personal reminiscences, however, do not seem to be borne out by the facts. Hsü Chih-mo, as already mentioned above, was genuinely committed to the task of saving China when he left his native land for America; and in his student days in both Clark and Columbia, he was as patriotic as any patriot could be. The surging tide of the May Fourth Movement in 1919 rolled across the Pacific and overwhelmed him almost as powerfully as it did the other Chinese youth at home,(162) and he read the then influential publications like Hsin ch'ing-nien (新青年) (New Youth), Hsin-ch'ao (新潮) (New Tide), Chung-kuo fu-nü tsa-chih(中國婦女雜誌) (The Chinese Women's Magazine), etc. even in America.(163) His patriotism and enthusiasm bubbled in his M.A. thesis "The Status of Women in China" (1920) which repudiated the western Christian missionaries' reports about the misery from which Chinese women suffered. He defended China as a civilized country. Basing himself on the May Fourth Movement and the New Culture Movement, he predicted a bright future of the Chinese women of tomorrow. Evidently he had developments in the Chinese socio-political situation at his finger tips. And after his arrival in London, he was

living among quite a number of Chinese friends[164] who were by no means indifferent to whatever was happening in China - to name just two: Lin Ch'ang-min, a politician and high official in the 1910's, and Fu Szu-nien (傅斯年), a leader of the May Fourth Movement and a founder of the Hsin-ch'ao magazine. Later in November, 1921, Hsü talked about Hu Shih and his works on philosophy and made suggestions to Russell;[165] still later, he was imparting information to J. Middleton Murry about the Literary Revolution in China which he called, probably following Hu Shih, "Renaissance".[166] As to the pai-hua poetry which became popular after the May Fourth Movement, Hsü was familiar with its development. The fact that people at home were using a new medium for literary works must have been a great fascination to him. He obviously read a good deal of the early pai-hua poets and despised them all except for Kuo Mo-jo; in fact he admired Kuo.[167] His early pai-hua poems written in Cambridge were evidence of the influence he felt from home. It must be pointed out, however, that he did not change to pai-hua overnight. There seemed to be a transitional period when he used both wen-yen and pai-hua. Like Wen I-to (聞一多) (1899-1946), he approached the matter with considerable caution in the beginning.[168] But after some hesitation and experiment, he responded to the literary revolution with enthusiasm.

Launching his bark of life in the sea of poetry (to reverse Hsü's own phrasing), he tasted the thrill and exultation of being a poet. It was the noblest career after which one could ever aspire; thus he sang to himself:

> O poet! Is it now not the time for you to
> go to sea?
> Why don't you make ready
> Your bark of poetry?

O poet, you are the precursor of the spirit
of the age;
You are the synthesizer of the art of all thoughts;
You are the creator between heaven and man.

.....

You exhibit the great rainbow of Truth, Goodness
and Beauty;
You dwell on the highest peak of the true Life![169]

5. Summing up.

The record at King's College has it that Hsü's status, first an advanced student, was later changed to a research student.[170] Sir John Harold Clapham's comments on him were: "Looks at the world with intelligence and propriety."[171] Hsü Chih-mo, albeit a research student, did no research at all; in fact he did not do any regular studies. Nor did he ever write any examinations or scholarly papers. He did not obtain a Ph.D. He had no academic reports to send home of which he could boast. And so in the eyes of Hsü Shen-ju, his son's study abroad eventually turned out to be a failure.[172] If the young man had remained in China, he might have followed in his footsteps and become a reasonably prosperous and respectable banker if not a great national figure controlling the state finances. But a literary man! What great expectation could a father fix on a son, and an only son, who wrote poetry? Hsü Chih-mo himself, however, certainly thought otherwise. Shortly before he left England in 1922 he wrote to Roger Fry: "No, I can never regret my sojourn in England; indeed I do not know whether I will not shed tears when in after days I look back to these days ..."[173] He had absolutely

nothing to repent of. The Cambridge period, in his opinion, was a success. Apart from the negative aspects of worries about love and divorce, his life in Cambridge was comparable to that of Liu Lao-lao (劉老老) in Ta-kuan Yüan (大觀園),[174] or the experience of St. Paul in the third heaven (II Corinthians 12: 2-4). He discovered new things, and had contact with new people. He spent his time making and visiting friends, plunging himself in many kinds of activities, enjoying scenic beauties, attending whatever lectures and reading whatever books and magazines that may have taken his fancy, courting solitude here and there, etc.[175] He certainly thought his time well spent. He extolled Cambridge, as his friends and predecessors Roger Fry and E. M. Forster did, as the only place where he really learned something.[176] He declared in retrospect:

> In my own case, my eyes were opened by Cambridge; my desire to learn was stimulated by Cambridge; the consciousness of my own being was nourished by Cambridge.[177]

Rupert Brooke's grateful feelings about Cambridge in his well-known poem "The Old Vicarage, Granchester" was also Hsü's. But Hsü's gratitude was even greater than the English poet's; he proclaimed: "Cambridge, aren't you my life's fountain-head? / Your precious gifts for me are countless."[178]

Hsü Chih-mo's "success" in Cambridge was not unlike St. Paul's conversion in front of the Damascus gate - he heard a call; he found his Lord; he dedicated himself to a life vocation. Cambridge to Hsü was more than a city or a university or a scenic spot. Cambridge was

father, mother, brother, sister, sweetheart, friend, art, literature, architecture, music, nature, wisdom, enlightenment, intellectual advancement, revelation, excitement, entertainment, leisure, comfort ... all in one! But few returned students of Hsü's generation felt as he did towards their alma maters and the foreign countries to which they owed their higher education. His predecessor Hu Shih, though with every reason to feel elated over his student days in America, did not cherish a sense of exhilaration, deep reverence and profound affection like Hsü's. Hsü's associates in his literary activities, Wen I-to and Liang Shih-ch'iu for instance, could only, on the whole, resent their western experience.(179) His Cambridge friend Wen Yüan-ning, a writer in his own right, hardly ever mentioned Cambridge. As to the other group of returned students, i.e. those who "studied the texts of the west and suffered the humiliation from the east [Japan] " as Kuo Mo-jo commented,(180) not a few of them shook their fists when leaving Japan after completing or half-completing their training there, and did often "look back in anger". What, then, made Hsü Chih-mo different from other fellow returned students? The answer that readily springs to mind is that Hsü had absolute financial security, which few other Chinese students enjoyed. Indeed, it is unconceivable how Hsü could have been "busy ... punting, cycling, smoking, chatting ..."(181) and so on if his bread and butter had been at stake, and the fact of financial security as an important factor contributing to Hsü's success must be acknowledged. None the less, Hsü was not the only wealthy Chinese in Cambridge, and although money, powerful as it is, frees man from many anxieties that often breed bitter feelings, just as it binds him to many miseries which can be as undesirable as poverty, it

does not lie behind every phenomenon of human life. In Hsü's case, there existed other factors which were less obvious, yet equally, if not more, decisive. First of all, the English educational system. Hsü was evidently disgusted with his undergraduate year at Clark.(182) His Columbia year, if a successful one in that he won an M.A., did not seem to have been a perfectly happy one. The loss of identity in an American university with a large student body, and the heavey course work that kept a student busy attending sometimes irksome classes and writing "reports", mainly of the patchwork type, without necessary gaining much substantial knowledge to the benefit of his intellectual advancement, all this was distasteful to Hsü.(183) Besides, New York City could have a soul-destroying effect on some people, and Hsü was one of those who had learned to hate capitalism and the "civilization of lofty skyscrapers and speeding motor-cars".(184) King's College, however, was entirely different. There, as if in a family, he was on friendly terms with a large number of people, and the personal contact with both tutors and students and with some ex-Kingsmen who still frequented the College, was edifying. For these Cambridge men on the whole were highly intelligent, sincere, open-minded, unworldly but not other-worldly, unconventional, and somewhat socialistic in outlook; above all, they were above national pride and racial prejudice which, being the daily phenomenon in America, had made some Chinese students, Wen I-to being a case in point, sworn enemies of America. The Cambridge atmosphere, in short, had an agreeable, gentle, steady and irresistible power of a mysterious kind to ch'ien-i mo-hua (潛移默化) (mould latently and transform quietly) a person, first "destroying" and then building up his character and shaping his outlook on life; or in Hsü's metaphor, it was a process of baking

potatoes which, when the time was ripe, would give out their flavour.[185] A baked potato would never turn raw again, and the Cambridge influence is, happily or unhappily as depends on the critic's philosophy, often permanent. In England, Hsü found in his friends a friendship which he could hardly enjoy among most of his compatriots at home.

Summing up Hsü's view with regard to his "success" in terms of reading and learning rather than formal study, we shall not fail to see that in America he had to work hard because he was compelled to, and in Cambridge he savoured learning because he loved it. The former was, at least to him, an almost barbarous pressure from without while the latter was a pleasant impulsion from within. Or in the ordinary terms prevalent among the educated Chinese, his study in America was tu-szu shu (讀死書) (reading dead books) whereas his stay, if not study, in Cambridge was tu huo shu (讀活書) (reading living books) which included books in print and not in print, and of the latter kind there was the "greatest book" of his - nature,[186] and still another one, very real, though invisible - friendship. His American education left him as much "a lump of ignorance" as he was previously in China,[187] but Cambridge proved to be a magic lamp that illumined his otherwise turbid soul. "The difference is by no means small," he declared.[188] Indeed it was not.

N O T E S

(Chapter one)

ABBREVIATIONS *

CPFK = Ch'en-pao fu-k'an (晨報副刊) (Supplement to the Peking Morning Post), Peking.

CW = Chiang Fu-ts'ung & Liang Shih-ch'iu (ed.), Hsü Chih-mo ch'üan-chi (徐志摩全集) (Complete Works of Hsü Chih-mo), Taipei, 1969, 6 vols.

PCCP = Pei-ching ch'en-pao (北京晨報) (Peking Morning Post), Peking.

* Also used in other chapters.

1. Most books about Hsü Chih-mo give 1896 as the year of his birth. While it is true that he was born, according to the traditional Chinese counting, in the twenty-second year during the reign of the Emperor Kuang-hsü (光緒), the last month of that particular year corresponded approximately to January, 1897 rather than to any month of 1896, and the 13th day of the 12th month in the twenty-second year of Kuang-hsü was exactly 15th January, 1897. Moreover, most people believe that Hsü died at thirty-six; actually, he lived on the earth only thirty-four years, eleven months and four days.

2. Hsü Shen-ju played a small role in the 1912 revolution though he kept silent about it even after the establishment of the republic. See Chang Chün-ku, Hsü Chih-mo chuan, p. 16. Chang's book first appeared in serials in Lien-ho pao (聯合報) (United Daily), Taipei in 1969. It must be pointed out that this publication, part of it based on a talk between the author and Hsü's first wife Chang Yu-i, is "half-history and half-fiction" as Prof. Liang Shih-ch'iu commented during an interview he kindly granted to me in 1971 in Taipei, and Madam Chang in her letter to me (without exact date; the postmark being 5th Nov. 1971) also confirmed that some of the details in the book are mere guesses. Since factual errors are numerous in almost every chapter of the book, scholars using it for reference must exercise extreme caution. But as for Hsü Shen-ju's revolutionary activity, Chang's account, based on reliable documents, can well be accepted.

3. The information about Hsü Shen-ju in this paragraph is gleaned from Chang Chün-ku (see note No. 2) and Ch'en Ts'ung-chou, Hsü Chih-mo nien-p'u.
   Inspite of the glaring mistakes in Chang Chün-ku and the inaccuracy of time in many, and errors in some, cases in Ch'en Ts'ung-chou, the information about Hsü Shen-ju in both seems to me reliable in that it shows common sense and in some way borne out by references cited therein. See Chang, pp. 9-16 and Ch'en, p. 1.
   Both Hsü Chih-mo himself and his relative Chiang Fu-ts'ung recorded how Hsü's father desired him to do further studies abroad exclusively in the field of economics and finance; see CW, II, p. 340 and I, p. 31.

4. See CW, I, p. 555.

5. In Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, Yin-ping shih wen-chi, IV, No. 10, pp. 6-9. This essay was first published in Japan in 1902.

6. See CW, I, pp. 553 f., 558 f.

7. See CW, II, p. 340.

8. See CW, I, p. 562, VI, pp. 99-102.

9. Liang Shih-ch'iu, T'an Hsü Chih-mo, p. 22.

10. According to the records (including all the certificates issued by the Chinese institutions where Hsü had been educated) kept in the Registrar's Office, Clark University, Hsü completed his secondary school in 1914 and then spent two years at Shanghai Baptist College and Theological Seminary. After that he attended a "special course" preparatory to the Law Department of Pei-yang (北洋) University in 1916. The academic year 1917-18 saw him in "the freshman class in Political Science in the Law School, Government University" (namely, Peking University). The reason why he was only "an auditor" there is unknown. All these facts correspond exactly neither to the information given in CW, I, pp. 559-561 nor to that recorded in Ch'en Ts'ung-chou, op. cit. pp. 9 f. I would think that the written documents kept at Clark should be more reliable than the "facts", largely based on memory and oral sources, in the above two books.

    Constantine Tung in his recent unpublished Ph.D. thesis "The Search for Order and Form: The Crescent Moon Society and the Literary Movement of Modern China, 1928-33", p. 87 states that Hsü after graduating from the Department of Political Science, Peking University, entered Clark to study sociology in 1918. This statement, supported by no evidence, is not true. Tung's thesis, as its title indicates, deals largely with Hsü Chih-mo and his associates; a separate chapter is devoted to Hsü. This work contains contradictions and a fairly large number of factual errors concerning not only Hsü Chih-mo but other people and incidents.

11. See Chiang Fu-ts'ung's account in CW, I, p. 30. Chang Chün-mai was educated in China and Europe. He was a whole-hearted supporter of Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, and was prominent in the fields of philosophy, politics, culture and education. He upheld many Confucian values in old age.

12. See CW, I, p. 562.

13. Ibid. pp. 562 f.

14. CW, II, p. 340.

15. Credit should be given to Chang Chün-ku for suggesting the meaning of the name "Chih-mo"; see his book Hsü Chih-mo chuan, p. 40.

16. See CW, II, p. 340.

17. CW, VI, pp. 99-102.

18. Ch'en Ts'ung-chou, op. cit. p. 14.

19. Archaeologist, Director of Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan, Prof. Li is one the most famous living Chinese scholars.

20. For information of the National Defence Society, Hsü, Li and Wu exchanging patriotic views, etc. see Wu Mi, "Hsü Chih-mo yü Hsüeh-lai", p. 585; and also Wu Mi, Wu Mi chih-chi, the last chüan (卷), p. 132.

21. Hsü did not register in the Department of Sociology as generally believed, and his first class honours was achieved after completing a summer school course at Cornell. All this information was kindly provided by Mr. Gerard T. Corcoran, Registrar, Clark University.

22. Contrary to all books containing biographical information of Hsü, he registered in the Department of Economics at Columbia. My information is from Mr. Andrew N. Greenwald, Assistant to the Manager, Records Division, Office of the Registrar, Columbia University who kindly wrote to me on 4th Nov. 1971 enclosing photocopies of all the records concerning Hsü's registration and academic performance at Columbia.

23. See Ho Keng-sheng, "Hsin-suan hua liu-mei", p. 28. Chang Chün-ku (op. cit. pp. 65 f.) gave details about Hsü's patriotic activities but they are in fact all misinformation as far as Hsü was concerned; for Hsü was no longer in America at that time.

24. For Hsü's reading Ruskin, Robert Owen, books on Soviet Russia, etc. in America see his "Nan-hsing tsa-chi".

25. CW, III, p. 243.

26. Hsü said he hated the statue of Liberty because it reminded him of big chimneys which were symbols of modern industry; see the reference in his "Nan-hsing tsa-chi".

27. CW, III, p. 505.

28. These words are in an essay of Hsü's written on 15th Oct. 1925. He gave the impression that he had been disenchanted from Nietzsche's influence which, in fact, never completely lost its hold over him; see CW, III, p. 505.

29. CW, III, p. 243.

30. Bertrand Russell, Political Ideals, p. 68.

31. Bertrand Russell, Principles of Social Reconstruction, p. 5.

32. See CW, III, p. 243.

33. Hsü left New York on 24th Sept. 1920. He spent a few days in Paris before coming to London in early October. At that time Russell was sailing for Shanghai where he arrived on 12th October. See CW, I, pp. 567, 569. Hsü made a big mistake in his essay "Wo so chih-tao ti K'ang-ch'iao" when he said that the time Russell was in China, he himself was in America; but the mistake might be perhaps due to the misprint of a Chinese character. See CW, III, p. 243. The error first made by Arthur Waley and then by Constantine Tung in relation to this point was apparently due to their basing their account on Hsü's essay without taking other facts into consideration; see Arthur Waley, "A Debt to China", p. 342; Constantine Tung, op. cit. p. 88.

34. Constantine Tung (op. cit. pp. 88 f. and 96) gives the misinformation that Hsü Chih-mo, having realized the absence of Russell after his arrival in England, enrolled at Cambridge and studied under Harold Laski there.

35. CW, I, p. 569. This letter was written in November, 1920, the exact day being unknown.

36. See CW, III, p. 98.

37. See CW, I, p. 568, VI, pp. 152 f. According to Hsü's own account, he met H. G. Wells first on a morning which was so warm that he opened his window(s) to let in the sun. Most probably it was still October, and this would mean that he came to know Wells shortly after his arrival in London.

38. For Hsü's own accounts other than that in note No. 37 about his friendship with Wells see CW, V, p. 185, III, pp. 9 f.

39. Leo Ou-fan Lee takes the "English men of fame" for I. A. Richards and others at Cambridge; but since the quotation is from Hsü's letter to his father written in Nov. 1920 (see CW, I, p. 569), that is about three months before he entered Cambridge, it can only have referred to those British people with whom Hsü made friends in the period of his London residence. See Leo Ou-fan Lee, "The Romantic Generation: A Study of Modern Chinese Men of Letters", p. 257; CW, I, p. 569.

40. Hsü mentioned Binyon in his letter to Waley (21st Feb. 1924); and according to Mrs. Waley (her letter to me dated 12th Nov. 1971), Waley knew H. G. Wells well. It seems natural that H. G. Wells would introduce Hsü, a Chinese, to Waley, a man interested in Chinese literature. And Waley, working in the British Museum, would probably introduce his Chinese friend to his chief and friend, Binyon.

41. CW, III, p. 497.

42. This strange relationship between these two men has a streak of homosexuality though I would not say they were practising homosexuals. Hsü made known to the world quite frankly the background of this romantic correspondence. Both men suffered from a kind of narcissism, feeling acutely the melancholy of

"Wan-chung feng-ch'ing wu ti chao" (萬種風情無地着) (Harbouring an abundance of emotion which finds no place for discharge), a line from a poem by Lin. For details and an example of such correspondence see Hsü Chih-mo, "I-feng ch'ing-shu". Incidentally, the dates given by Hsü in this article are not quite accurate. See also Liang Ching-ch'un, "Lin Ch'ang-min hsien-sheng chuan", p. 10.

43. The year of Lin Hui-yin's birth given here has been inferred from the information that she was engaged at twenty-three in the year of 1927 (see CW, I, p. 634). Supposing that she was born before October, she should have been just over sixteen when she first met Hsü in London. The year of her death was after 1945 and before 1949; this latter piece of information was from Prof. H. T. Ch'en of Dept. of Asian Studies, University of British Columbia, Canada.

44. Most people considered Lin Hui-yin a pretty girl. She can be seen in a picture reproduced in Stephen N. Hay, Asian Ideas of East and West: Tagore and His Critics in Japan, China and India, (facing page 111). A print of the same picture was given me to keep by Mr. L. K. Elmhirst, the owner of the original. Lin Hui-yin's father was reported to have said that as far as knowledge of Chinese and western literatures, character and facial beauty were concerned, his daughter was second to none in China then (see Ch'en Ts'ung-chou, op. cit. p. 23). Madam Ling Shu-hua (凌叔華) told me in an interview in January, 1970 that Hsü's was a case of "i-chien chung-ch'ing" (一見鍾情) (falling in love at first sight). This affair, though known among Hsü's intimate friends and sometimes even talked about by Hsü Chih-mo himself to one or two of them (see CW, I, p. 390 for instance), had been hushed up for decades since Lin Hui-yin afterwards married Liang Ch'i-ch'ao's eldest son, and any exposure of such a fact would embarrass the several families concerned. Chiang Fu-ts'ung and Liang Shih-ch'iu, apparently acting on grounds of friendship and Confucian moral principles, did not mention it when editing the CW in 1968 (their attitude being clear in CW, I, p. 542); Hsü's first wife was also absolutely silent. However, she changed her mind later in 1968 or 1969 wheh she confirmed the hidden romance to Chang Chün-ku in Taipei (see note No. 2). Chang keeps a recording tape of the talk but seems reluctant to make it available to others.

According to Mr. L. K. Elmhirst, Hsü was still in love with Lin Hui-yin even after he met Lu Hsiao-man, Hsü's second wife. His account is borne out by Lu Hsiao-man's letter to Hsü dated 28th Mar. 1925 (see CW, IV, p. 420).

45. Lin Hui-yin's attending an Edinburgh school is reported by Chang Chün-ku, op. cit. p. 114. I think it may well be true.

46. E. M. Forster quoted Dickinson's words addressed to some Cambridge students as : "I am speaking to you about China, not because I know anything about the subject or because I once visited the country, but because, in a previous existence, I actually was a Chinaman!" See Forster's book, Goldsworthy Lowes Dickinson, p. 142.

47. According to Hsü himself, he spent "half a year" in L.S.E. (see CW, III, pp. 243 f.). This "half a year" presumably is not exactly six months. Harold Laski, Hsü's supervisor at L.S.E., believed Hsü started his residence in Cambridge by February, 1921 (see his letter to Mrs. J. Mair, then secretary of L.S.E., dated 25th Feb. 1922). Actually Hsü did not inform L.S.E. of his withdrawal.

48. See entry by Sir John Harold Clapham in the tutorial record of King's College, Cambridge.

49. CW, II, p. 341. Constantine Tung (op. cit. p. 88) says that Hsü Chih-mo switched his interest to poetry while still at Clark. This factual error may have been due to Hsü's own words "Before I was twenty-four, my interest in poetry was far less keen than my interest in relativity or social contract" (CW, II, p. 340). However, it must be noted that Hsü counted his age by the western rather than the Chinese way, and therefore the year when he was twenty-four was 1921. This is confirmed in the following paragraph the main portion of which is the very quotation to which this note is related. The "Preface" to Hsü's third collection of poems from which my quotation is taken was written in 1931; that is why I put "1921" after the phrase "Ten full years ago". Incidentally, Hsü as early as 1920 already condemned the traditional Chinese way in counting a person's age; he adopted the western way and urged his family to do the same; see his letter to his father in CW, I, p. 569.

50. See note No. 44.

51. See CW, I, p. 570.

52. In the "Nien-p'u" (年譜) in CW, I, p. 570, Hsü's wife's arrival in London is classed under the year 1920. This seems incorrect; for when Hsü wrote home on 26th Nov. 1920, it was not yet decided when his wife would set sail since there seemed to be nobody to accompany her. Her arrival, therefore, could not be earlier than January, 1921, and probably later.

53. Madam Chang Yu-i in her letter to me (undated; the post-mark being 5th Nov. 1971) said this idea, recorded by Chang Chün-ku, was her "guess". In my opinion, it was not groundless.

54. Ch'en Ts'ung-chou was the first person to mention this (Ch'en, op. cit. p. 14), but his book was discredited by Chiang Fu-ts'ung and Liang Shih-ch'iu who omitted this incident while still using Ch'en's book as a source to compile the "Nien-p'u" in CW, I. However, Chang Yu-i's ultimate confirmation of Lin Hui-yin's involvement in Hsü's life (see the latter part of note No. 44) has borne out Ch'en's account at least on this point.

55. Lin was already opposed to arranged marriage and in favour of free love as early as 1920 when he was in England. Shortly after his return to China in 1921, he gave speeches on these subjects in Peking (see note No. 42 especially Liang Ching-ch'un's article). Madam Ling Shu-hua told me in an interview in January, 1970 that once when Hsü Chih-mo and Lin Hui-yin were taking a walk in Cambridge, Lin Ch'ang-min said admiringly: "What an excellent pair!"

56. Russell's words concerning his relations with Dora Black before their marriage; see Bertrand Russell, Auto-biography of Bertrand Russell, II, p. 111.

57. See Chang Chün-ku, op. cit. pp. 131 f. for details which Madam Chang Yu-i confirmed in her letter to me.

58. CW, II, p. 243.

59. A. C. Ward, Twentieth-Century Literature 1901-1950, p. 172.

60. See CW, I, pp. 137-186, 239-338. These include his translations.

61. See CW, I, p. 143.

62. The manuscripts of Hsü's early verses (translations included) reproduced in fascimile show that some of them were written apparently in ordinary western ink, by western pen and on western paper while the others, in Chinese ink, by Chinese writing brush and on paper manufactured in Chekiang province. In my opinion, poems of the former kind were done in England and the latter kind in his native province Chekiang after he returned to China. It seems that in China he seldom used a western pen just as he seldom wore western clothes.

63. CW, I, pp. 359 f. See also Hsü's letter to Liang Ch'i-ch'ao in CW, I, p. 361.

64. See Chiang Fu-ts'ung, "Hsü Chih-mo hsiao-chuan" (徐志摩小傳) (A Short Biography of Hsü Chih-mo) in CW, I, pp. 29-34 and Hu Shih, "Chui-tao Chih-mo" (追悼志摩) (In Memory of Chih-mo) in CW, I, pp. 355-368.

65. For the relationship between Hsü and Yü see CW, I, pp. 375-384; Yü Ta-fu, "Huai szu-shih sui ti Chih-mo", pp. 364 f.; Yü Ta-fu, Ta-fu san-wen chi, p. 243; Yü Ta-fu, Ta-fu jih-chi, pp. 236, 238. See also chapter 2, pp. 90 f.

66. For the facts about Yü Ta-fu discussed here see the entries covering 1926 and 1927 in his diary, i.e., Ta-fu jih-chi; Yü Ta-fu, "Kuan-yü pien-chi, chieh-shao, i-chi shih-shih teng-teng", p. 111; Sun Pai-kang, "Yü Ta-fu yü Wang Ying-hsia", pp. 488-538.

67. The romance between Lu Hsün and Hsü Kuang-p'ing is well known. Lu Hsün never lived with his legal wife; whenever he returned home to see his mother, he simply ignored his wife's existence. See Wan Sen-jan, Chin-tai erh-shih chia p'ing-chuan, pp. 288 f.; Yang Chih-hua, Wen-t'an shih-liao, p. 26. As to Kuo Mo-jo, he gave all the details about his unhappy marriage in Mo-jo wen-chi, VI, pp. 266-290; for reader of English an account about it can be found in David T. Roy, Kuo Mo-jo, the Early Years, the 3rd chapter, especially pp. 44 f.

68. Li Chin-kao, "Ching-yang Wu Mi", p. 25.

69. For the facts about Wu Mi in this passage see Wu Mi, Wu Mi shih-chi, chüan 11, p. 11; chüan 13, pp. 1, 34; the last chüan, p. 198. See also Fang Lan-ju, "Wu Yü-seng yü 'Wen-hsüeh fu-k'an' ", p. 23.

70. See Chang Chün-ku, op. cit., pp. 125 f. Hsü Chih-mo's suggestion of abortion was confirmed by Madam Chang Yu-i in her letter to me (undated; the postmark being 5th Nov. 1971).

71. Wen Yüan-ning (Ni Shou-min tr.), "Hsü Chih-mo - i-ko ta hai-tzu", p. 25.

72. See CW, III, p. 315.

73. CW, I, p. 362.

74. This letter and others were located in the Bertrand Russell Archives through the kind help of Mr. Kenneth Blackwell, McMaster University, Canada.

75. Liang Ch'i-ch'ao hinted at Chang Yu-i's attitude in his letter to Hsü Chih-mo dated 2nd Jan. 1923. Liang when lecturing in Nanking stayed with Chang Chün-mai (Hsü's brother-in-law) in the same house for weeks; they talked about all sorts of things "days and nights" and Liang should have been well-informed of Chang Yu-i's thought; see Ting Wen-chiang (ed.), Liang Jen-kung hsien-sheng nien-p'u ch'ang-pien ch'u-kao, p. 628; see also CW, I, p. 134.

76. CW, I, p. 360. These are Hu Shih's words.

77. CW, I, p. 133.

78. CW, III, p. 256.

79. CW, III, p. 255.

80. See CW, III, pp. 247, 250 f.

81. The poem was later published in CPFK, 1st. Dec. 1923 but not included in any of Hsü's collections. It has never been mentioned by any critic though Wang T'ung-chao, as editor of Wen-hsüeh hsün-k'an (文學旬刊), added a postscript to the poem calling the reader's attention to it. See chapter 2, pp. 146 f.

82. See Hsü's letter to Roger Fry dated 7th Sugust, 1922.

83. E. M. Forster, op. cit. p. 239.

84. See King's College (comp.), Goldsworthy Lowes Dickinson, p. 16. This booklet is "for distribution to Members of the College" only.

85. E. M. Forster, op. cit. p. 200.

86. See Hsü Chih-mo, "Art and Life", pp. 1-15.

87. These words are from the caption of a cartoon of Dickinson who was represented as Lao-tzu, holding a Chinese book in one hand and a lantern in another, and riding on an ox against the background of King's College chapel under a crescent moon. All this may be regarded as the image of Dickinson in Cambridge. See The Old Cambridge, II:4, 1920, p. 13.
Dickinson's book The Greek View of Life (1896) was well known at that time. See also Michael Holroyd, Lytton Strachey and the Bloomsbury Group, p. 49.

88. See Arthur Waley, "A Debt to China", p. 343, also p. 38.

89. Hsü's letter to Roger Fry dated 7th Aug. 1922.

90. The quotation is reported speech about Hsü by Mr. Rolf Gardiner. It was kindly conveyed to me in a letter dated 17th Dec. 1969 by Dr. Martin Bernal, Fellow of King's College, Cambridge.

91. Dickinson's rooms are on the top floor. One can surely make oneself comfortable even sitting by the door on the floor.

92. Madam Ling Shu-hua told me about this in an interview in January, 1970. She also said the picture was painted by Roger Fry.

93. CW, VI, p. 143.

94. CW, VI,p. 143.

95. E. M. Forster, op. cit. p. 154. There is a picture showing Dickinson wearing a Chinese cap in this book.

96. Arthur Waley, op. cit. p. 343.

97. Ibid.
Stephen N. Hay in his book Asian Ideas of East and West (p. 194) says Hsü in Cambridge studies under Dickinson; this is not accurate.

98. See Hsü's letter to Roger Fry dated 7th Aug. 1922.

99. Hsü's letter to Roger Fry dated 7th Aug. 1922.

100. Hsü mentioned in his letter to Roger Fry dated 7th Aug. 1922 that the "present" could be sent to him in Cambridge from London and I could hardly imagine that this object was the portrait. The two sketches by Fry with inscriptions "To Tsemou Hsü; Roger Fry" and "To my friend Tsemou Hsü; Roger Fry" respectively were reproduced in the Crescent Moon Monthly II:1, 1929.

101. See Roger Fry's article "Some Aspects of Chinese Art", pp. 67-81. Hsü seemed to have with him quite a number of Chinese scrolls of both painting and calligraphy when he was in England; see CW, V, p. 186.
Fry himself collected quite a number of Chinese antiques which are now in the possesion of his daughter Mrs. Pamela Diamand who showed them to me during an interview in December, 1971. For further reference see also Enid Huws Jones, Margery Fry, p. 173.

102. See Roger Fry, The Artist and Psycho-Analysis, p. 11.

103. Virginia Woolf, Roger Fry, p. 86.

104. Roger Fry's daughter Mrs. Pamela Diamand remembered Hsü's visits to her father's house vividly and told me all about them during an interview in December, 1971.

105. See CW, IV, p. 386 and V, p. 189, and Hsü's postcard to L. K. Elmhirst dated 11th Aug. 1928.

106. See Hsü's English article "Art and Life", p. 13.

107. See Hsü Chih-mo, "Liang-wei shih-chieh ti lao-t'ou lai-hsin"; in this article Hsü also mentioned his epeech about Carpenter and others given in 1923; see also CW, III, p. 9.

108. See Hsü Chih-mo, "Liang-wei shih-chieh ti lao-t'ou lai-hsin".

109. Kai-yu Hsu (tr. & ed.), Twentieth Century Chinese Poetry, p. 71. Howard L. Boorman (ed.), Biographical Dictionary of Republican China, II, p. 122 also has similar information which may or may not have been provided by Kai-yu Hsu. Boorman's book lists the contributors of the articles only collectively.

110. Hsü Chih-mo, "K'ai-hen-szu".

111. Ibid.

112. Ibid.

113. See Yü Ta-fu, "Wu shih mang che hsien-t'an".

114. See E. M. Forster, op. cit. p. 154. Robert Payne (ed.), Contemporary Chinese Poetry, p. 35 also contains information about Hsü and Forster but I suspect that all the details are just exaggerations supported by no evidence. Payne's book, journalistic in tone, has numerous factual errors.

115. Mrs. Waley told me in her letter (dated 12th Nov. 1971) that her husband knew almost all the Bloomsbury people well. Waley himself in his article (op. cit. p. 342) seemed to give the impression that Strachey knew Hsü.

116. J. K. Johnstone, The Bloomsbury Group, p. 116.

117. See Obituary of Arthur Waley in Times, 28th June, 1966.

118. Hsü in one of his essays written in 1923 (see CW, V, pp. 186 f.) seemed to imply that he had seen Virginia Woolf and her sister Vanessa (Mrs. Clive Bell) and he expressed some negative impression of them owing to their over-casualness and mannish demeanour, but in an undated letter to Roger Fry (judging from the content it was written during Hsü's second visit to England in 1928), he praised the woman writer's beauty as well as her novel To the Lighthouse (1927) and asked Fry to introduce him to her if at all possible. Most probably Hsü had never met Virginia Woolf or her sister before, and he only wanted to

give the impression that he had when writing the essay (as mentioned above) for the Chinese.

119. Clive Bell, of the Bloomsbury group, went so far as to say: "... historians are bound to wonder whether there ever was such a thing [Bloomsbury group] . At last they may come to doubt whether 'Bloomsbury' ever existed." See his book Old Friends, p. 137.

120. For the Bloomsbury group see J. Maynard Keynes, "My Early Beliefs", in his Two Memoirs; J. K. Johnstone, op. cit.; Clive Bell, Old Friends; Michael Holroyd, op. cit.

121. Waley's failure to "qualify" himself for "membership" might have been due to his shyness; see Michael Holroyd, op. cit. p. 47.

122. The letter was dated 21st Feb. 1924. When Hsü came to London the next year for a visit, he spent a night at Waley's flat in Gordon Square; see CW, IV, p. 386.

123. Arthur Waley, op. cit. p. 344. See also Hsü's letter to Waley dated 21st Feb. 1924.

124. Arthur Waley, op. cit. p. 344.

125. Cf. Hua Wu, "Ying-kuo ti han-hsüeh-chia", p. 326.

126. Prof. I. A. Richards's letter to me dated 16th Dec. 1971.

127. Arthur Waley, op. cit. p. 342.

128. See Prof. I. A. Richards's letter to me dated 16th Dec. 1971 and CW, V, p. 186.

129. Both Russell and his second wife even in their old age still remembered how amusing Hsü was; see Russell's note attached to Hsü's letters written to him and also Mrs. Dora Russell's letter written to me on 18th Nov. 1971.

130. The "Sphinx" expression (expressionlessness) was the impression the Chinese students at Colorado, including Hsü's friends Wen I-to and Liang Shih-ch'iu, gave to the American students who were curious about the "mystery" that might hide behind the oriental faces. See Liang Shih-ch'iu, T'an Wen I-to, p. 40.

131. Prof. I. A. Richards's letter to me dated 16th Dec. 1971. Liang Shih-ch'iu gives the identical witness in T'an Hsü Chih-mo, p. 30.

132. Hsü's academic performance in his undergraduate years both in China and in America was remarkable. However, this seemed to be a manifestation of a good memory rather than academic excellence in the strict sense. The results of his Columbia year were ordinary and his M.A. thesis had hardly any scholarship. See the records related to him kept in the Registrar's Office at Clark and Columbia respectively; and also see his M.A. thesis kept in the Library of Columbia University.

133. The information is from Prof. I. A. Richards's letter to me dated 16th Dec. 1971. See also Leo Ou-fan Lee, op. cit. p. 257.
The Heretics's Club was founded in Cambridge in 1909 and C. K. Ogden may be called the most important figure in it up to 1924. It met almost every Sunday night for free discussion "on problems of religion, philosophy and art"; later social sciences was also included. Almost all the members, predominantly Fabians, belonged to some political society outside the Club and so politics was the only subject absent from the agenda of the discussions. G. E. Moore, Roger Fry, Lytton Strachey, Meynard Keynes et al in addition to Bertrand Russell, had all been invited to give lectures. It is clear that the Club was not just "a literary circle dedicated to prosody and translation" as Leo Ou-fan Lee says (see Lee, op. cit. p.257). Prof. P. Sargant Florence, once the president of the Club in the twenties who still remembers the name of Hsü Chih-mo vaguely (see his letter written to me dated 11th Jan. 1972), wrote a detailed account of the Heretics (see his "The Cambridge Heretics, 1909-1932", pp. 223-240). The Secretary of the University Library, Cambridge wrote to me saying the last reference to the Club can be found in the Varsity Handbook 1969/70, Cambridge; however, judging from some information in his (or her ?) letter (dated 17th Dec. 1971), the Handbook does not seem to be quite accurate. Prof. I. A. Richards called the Club "a loose sort of discussion society" (see his letter to me dated 16th Dec. 1971) which was confirmed by Prof. Florence's account. As to the speakers invited by the Heretics to give lectures, the Cambrdige Calendar, in addition to Prof. Florence's article, is a reliable source.

134. The acknowledgement of the authors and the two Chinese characters can be seen from C. K. Ogden et al, The Foundations of Aesthetics, p. 8 and the front page respectively.

135. Prof. I. A. Richards's letter to me dated 16th Dec. 1971.

136. Ibid.

137. See Hu Shih, "Fan-i chih nan", pp. 14 f.

138. See CW, III, p. 243.

139. See Hsü's letter to Russell dated 24th Oct. 1921. Constantine Tung is wrong in affirming that Hsü "never succeeded in making the acquaintance of ... Russell." See Tung, op. cit. p. 111.

140. See Hsü's letter to the Russells dated 6th Dec. 1921.

141. See Hsü's letter to the Russells dated 6th Dec. 1921.

142. See Hsü's letter to them dated 29th Aug. 1922 after receiving their telegram.

143. See Hsü Chih-mo, "Lo Su yü Chung-kuo".

144. See Hsü's letters to L. K. Elmhirst dated 13th Jan. 1925; Friday night [no day given], Sept. 1928; Saturday [no day given], Sept. 1928 respectively.

145. See CW, III, p. 88.

146. This note (undated) was attached to Hsü's letters in the Bertrand Russell Archives, McMaster University, Canada. As it was written with a ball-point pen, Mr. Kenneth Blackwell, the Archivist, dated it not earlier than the later 1950's when Russell started using ball-point pens.

147. For Hsü's meeting with Katherine Mansfield see his essay "Man-shu-fei-erh" (曼殊斐爾) (Katherine Mansfield), in CW, V, pp. 177-203, and also CW, VI, p. 305.

148. See CW, VI, p. 149.

149. See CW, V, pp. 108-113 and Hsü Chih-mo, "Hsiao-po-na ti ke-yen".

150. See Arthur Waley, op. cit. p. 343.

151. See CW, VI, pp. 145 f. Hsü gives the impression that Conrad is second to none except Hardy. See also Hsü's letter to Miss Li Ch'i dated 21st July, [1929].

152. Hsü was already seen at meetings of this organization before he entered Cambridge; see CW, III, p. 244.

153. See publications of that period like The Old Cambridge, Cambridge Calendar, The Query Magazine, Cocoon, Youth, etc.

154. See Cambridge Calendar and The Old Cambridge of that period. Hsü in his "Tsai t'ien chi-chü hsien-hua ti hsien-hua ch'eng-pien wang-hsiang chieh-wei" mentions his attending "Mr. Q's lectures several times" in Cambridge. This "Mr. Q" is most probably Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch who gave a series of lectures on Shelley during that period.

155. Cocoon, Youth, The Query Magazine, etc.

156. See this chapter, p.40.

157. See this chapter, p. 42.

158. Mao Tun, "Hsü Chih-mo lun", p. 530. Both Bonnie S. McDougall and Constantine Tung made similar remarks but they did not seem to be acquainted with Mao Tun's critique; see McDougall, The Introduction of Western Literary Theories into Modern China, p. 259 and Tung, op. cit. p. 77. A contrary statement can be seen in Stephen N. Hay, op. cit. p. 194 with which I disagree.

159. Hsü Chih-mo, "Nan-hsing tsa-chi".

160. See his essay "Cheng-chih sheng-huo yü Wang-chia san-a-sao" (政治生活與王家三阿嫂) (Political Life and Mrs. Wang), in CW, III, pp. 85-110.

161. See Wang K'ang, "Po-hsüeh to-ts'ai ti Wen Yüan-ning ta-shih".

162. See CW, I, p. 567.

163. See Hsü's M.A. thesis, "The Status of Women in China" (1920), Columbia University.

164. See Hsü's London addresses on L.S.E. records.

165. Hsü's letter to Russell dated 7th Nov. 1921.

166. See CW, V, pp. 184 f.

167. See Hsü's letter to Ch'eng Fang-wu in Ch'uang-tsao chou-pao (創造周報) (Creation Weekly), No. 4, 1923, p. 13. A translation of its major part can be seen in chapter 2, p. 88.

168. See Hsü's early prose and poetry writings done in England, namely, "An-szu-t'an hsiang-tui chu-i", "Lo Su yu-O-chi shu-hou" and "P'ing Wei-erh-szu yu-O-chi". The first one was written in pai-hua and the lattar two in wen-yen. They were sent to China and published in Kai-tsao (改造)(The Reconstruction), III:8, 1921, pp. 49-64; III:10, 1921 pp. 51-54; III:10, 1921, pp. 55-58 respectively. As to Hsü's early unpublished poems and translations now still existing and contained in CW, I, it is clear that some of them were written in wen-yen and others in pai-hua. For Wen I-to's change from wen-yen to pai-hua see Chu Tzu-ch'ing et al (ed.) Wen I-to ch'üan-chi, I, p. 33.

169. CW, I, 141 f.

170. See R. H. Bulmer and L. P. Wilkinson (comp.), A Register of Admission to King's College, 1918-58, p. 36. The information about Hsü in this book is scanty but not free from errors; however, as far as Hsü's status in the latter part of his years at King's is concerned, it is correct. Its source on this particular point is evidently from a registration sheet kept on file at King's.

171. The tutorial record of King's College.

172. See CW, IV, p. 503.

173. Hsü's letter to Roger Fry dated 7th Aug. 1922.

174. Liu Lao-lao, an old woman from the country, finds everything new and interesting in the affluent Ta-kuan yüan; see the 40th and 41st chapters in Hung-lou meng (紅樓夢) (The Dream of the Red Chamber).

175. See CW, III, p. 239.

176. See Virginia Woolf, Roger Fry, p. 60; L. Trilling, E. M. Forster, p. 26.

177. CW, III, pp. 238 f.

178. CW, VI, pp. 32 f.

179. See Chu Tzu-ch'ing et al (ed.), op. cit. Keng chi (庚集), p. 69. Wen I-to in a letter to his family accused the Americans of their racial prejudice and expressed his boiling indignation and simultaneously his Chinese cultural pride. See also Liang Shih-ch'iu, "Kung-li", pp. 125-132. This short story is an account of the injustice the Chinese students suffered in America. Two of the three characters in it are Liang and Wen respectively. Liang in a letter to Kuo Mo-jo also betrayed his impatience and dissatisfaction in staying in America; eventually he did not complete his graduate studies at Harvard (see Liang Shih-ch'iu, "T'ung-hsin i tse", p. 15). Bitterness on this particular point still can be seen in Liang's recent writings; see the following: T'an Wen I-to, p. 47; "P'i-p'a chi ti yen-ch'u", p. 18; Ch'iu-shih tsa-i, p. 66; "Hsü Chih-mo yü 'Hsin-yüeh' ", p. 19.

180. Kuo Mo-jo, Mo-jo shu-hsin chi, p. 98.

181. Hsü's own words about his Cambridge life; see CW, III, p. 239.

182. Lin Yutang reported that Hsü answered his question saying: "At Clark ... I just listened to the bell and walked into or out of the classroom accordingly. Nothing learned! I learned to learn only when I came to Cambridge afterwards." See Lin Yutang, Wu so pu t'an, p. 20. See also Hsü's letter to his father in CW, I, p. 569, or see my translation in this chapter, pp. 17 f.

183. See CW, III, p. 239, VI, p. 470.

184. See this chapter pp. 14 f. and Hsü Chih-mo, "Nan-hsing tsa-chi"; see also CW, VI, p. 29.

185. See CW, III, p. 238.

186. See CW, III, p. 234.

187. See CW, III, p. 239.

188. Ibid.

CHAPTER TWO

A. Pursuit of love.

The first half of 1922 saw China in turbulence in the domestic political arena. Dr. Sun Yat-sen, the "Provisional President" in the south, was having trouble with his military subordinate, the ambitious Ch'en Chiung-ming (陳炯明), who eventually forced Sun to flee to Shanghai in August. In the north, the Chili (直隸) and Fengtien (奉天) militarists[1] were at odds with each other and their difference culminated in a battle in May with the result that the Chili warlord Wu P'ei-fu (吳佩孚) emerged as the strong man. He and his associates succeeded in expelling the president of the Republic Hsü Shih-ch'ang (徐世昌) and re-instating Li Yüan-hung (黎元洪) in June.

As to the New Culture Movement, the open assult on Confuciansim was something of a yesterday in 1922 (though the fighting never completely ceased) and the battle for pai-hua as medium of literary writing was already won. The most remarkable event of the year, the anti-religious movement which was initiated by Ch'en Tu-hsiu (陳獨秀) in 1918, reached its climax in April, 1922 in the formation of the Great Federation of Anti-Religionists.[2]

However, when Hsü Chih-mo returned to China in October, the whole country was relatively peaceful. But peaceful or otherwise, nothing except his personal affairs would engage his attention. He made the journey home from Europe not because he thought he had completed his studies, or was desperately longing to see his parents, or was too patriotic to stay long abroad, but because he had sensed a looming crisis in his relationship with Lin Hui-yin;[3] he desired to get in direct touch with her so as to sort

things out, and his greatest wish was of course to win her, to marry her, and to bring her back to Cambridge in the next Spring.(4) Whether he wanted to work seriously for a higher degree in Cambridge is not known, but he did wish to return to Europe in a few months' time.(5) What rendezvous he had and what letters he exchanged with Lin Hui-yin upon arriving home would remain a mystery, but a letter written by Liang Ch'i-ch'ao (not known to Hsü) revealed that she had promised to marry Liang's son before Hsü's return.(6) However, Liang wanted them to complete their studies before finalizing the engagement.(7)

Liang Ch'i-ch'ao was well aware of Hsü's feelings towards Lin Hui-yin.(8) His reluctance to make definite the engagement between his son and the girl seemed to indicate great caution on his side. First of all, he was not in favour of a long engagement.(9) Secondly, he would not have wanted to afflict on Hsü Chih-mo a direct blow since he was genuinely fond of him and appreciative of his talents.(10) Finally, he was obviously not too sure of Hui-yin's feelings.(11) Most teenagers were fickle at least in a way, and a young girl who had been exposed to free love and had actually had an affair abroad might do unexpected things. What if she should swallow her words and surrender to the tempestuous onslaughts from Hsü Chih-mo? Liang Ch'i-ch'ao knew only too well that even a formal betrothal had no binding power; and to avoid any possible scandal and unpleasantness, the safest policy would have been to wait and see.(12)

As for the girl herself, young as she was, it would not have been difficult for her to see that Hsü's family wealth was nothing in comparison with the national and even international prestige and academic excellence of the Liang family which was in any case rich enough to ensure

her a comfortable life. On the other hand, it was plain that marriage with Hsü, a man with a record of divorce, would certainly arouse criticism from many people whereas a union with Liang Szu-ch'eng (梁思成) was definitely an intellectual and material blessing to herself and gratification to her family.(13) Moreover, in terms of age, Hsü was eight years her senior and was perhaps a little too old for her in Chinese eyes. Hsü Chih-mo, a romantic, was an excellent boy friend good for "jest, and youthful jollity", but could such a person make a good husband? Since he could desert his pregnant wife in a foreign country, would he not do similar things after a second marriage when he again came under the spell of some romantic whims? Such questions may have occurred to Lin Hui-yin when she was debating with herself whether to accept or reject Hsü once and for all. Here it must be noted in passing that Hui-yin was a clear-headed young woman of fairly strong character.(14) When a vital and final decision had to be made with regard to marriage, she weighed all the advantages and disadvantages, and dropped Hsü Chih-mo in favour of Liang Szu-ch'eng. But Hsü could hardly give her up. It would seem that the fact of Hui-yin and Szu-ch'eng having not been formally engaged reserved for him still a glimmer of hope.

So Hsü Chih-mo, with strong attachment to Cambridge on the one hand and with the same feelings towards his girl friend on the other, chose to remain in China. Living vaguely in suspense, he told Roger Fry in a letter that his life in Peking was, understandably, "not very happy".(15) And Liang Ch'i-ch'ao's unwillingness to legalize the engagement between his son and Lin Hui-yin proved a most cruel mental torture to Hsü whose sorrow and pain were recorded in his writings.(16)

During and shortly before Tagore's visit to China in 1924, Hsü had more opportunity to be near Lin Hui-yin, and his hope might have been raised a little.(17) An unfinished "love letter" written by him in that year reads:

> I really don't know what I want to say. I'd tried several times to write a letter, but could hardly finish it. My head has been swimming these two days, with my eyes, open or closed, just seeing the dim and sad moonlight shining on our reluctant train which slowly retreated towards the wilderness three days ago. Departure! How can it be true? I become mad whenever I think of it. So many entanglements; who can cut them off? There is darkness in front of my eyes again!

According to L. K. Elmhirst, the letter was intended for Lin Hui-yin who saw Hsü, Tagore and his entourage off one night at the Peking rail station.(18) This unfinished piece indicated Hsü's persistent love for Lin Hui-yin which, again according to Elmhirst, was not completely dispelled till 1926 when Hsü was convinced of Lin Hui-yin's coquetry.(19)

Liang Szu-ch'eng sailed for America for further studies in summer, 1924 and Lin Hui-yin probably went with him.(20) In the same year, Hsü Chih-mo became acquainted with Lu Hsiao-man (陸小曼)(21) whose husband, Wang Keng (王賡), a graduate of West Point, was also reckoned as a disciple of Liang Ch'i-ch'ao.(22) Leo Ou-fan Lee commented on the affair between Hsü and Hsiao-man saying:

> Hsiao-man's initial appeal to him [Hsü], we may surmise, was not so much her beauty or talent as her immense popularity in the Peking high society. In chasing her ... Hsü may have had an exhilarating feeling of playing an

> exciting game. The temptation of vanity in winning the heart of the most popular socialite in Peking must have been irresistible ...(23)

While this may well be true, there is still a possible factor not to be neglected. Hsü Chih-mo, jilted by Lin Hui-yin, must have felt the need of compensation. Indeed, he was not the type of person who would resign himself passively to his fate after a failure. His own words can best illustrate his attitude:

> We who have been baptized in the western philosophy of life ... will never acknowledge defeat, retreat, or fold up our banner unless we have been driven to an absolute impasse; and even if expression of despair is inevitable, we often turn to our own life for a solution... we would rather commit suicide ... (24)

To Hsü a paradise lost only meant a paradise to be regained, or another one to be gained. He would work out his salvation. In this respect, to win Lu Hsiao-man was not only "playing an exciting game", or displaying the charm of a great lover, or exhibiting courage of a social reformer of marriage, but saving his own face and launching a noble enterprise.(25) Hsü throughout his life was the kind of person who hated to lose in any game. Starting as an infant prodigy who was invariably at the top of his class at school, he grew up to be a worthy disciple of Nietzsche.

In this second affair, Hsü identified himself, as it were, with a brave and handsome prince in the medieval romance who was going to rescue a beautiful princess imprisoned by an evil creature.(26) He made Lu Hsiao-man believe that she lost her identity in an arranged marriage and became a slave and victim.(27) He also convinced her

that they would enjoy a wonderful married life simply by her divorcing her husband.(28) Evidently Hsü acquainted Hsiao-man with his sorrowful experience with Lin Hui-yin; he may or may not have done it to win her pity in addition to her love, but the result was that he captured both.(29) But this time things were complicated; Lu Hsiao-man was not an unmarried girl but a married woman, and her husband was a high-ranking government official. Chinese society, on the whole, frowned on divorce and especially on that kind of wild romance existing between Hsü and Hsiao-man which Liang Ch'i-ch'ao condemned as something "highly immoral".(30) In the spring of 1925, when their affair developed into a scandal in Peking and pressure from all sides grew more and more formidable, Hsü left the capital for Europe. We shall carry on his love with Lu Hsiao-man in the next chapter as a relevant factor in the composition of his love poems.

B. Talks and teaching.

Apparently to be as near Lin Hui-yin as possible and also to be moving amidst the highest Chinese cultural circles, Hsü Chih-mo went to Peking when he had spent some time at home and a few days with Liang Ch'i-ch'ao in Nanking after his return from Europe.(31) Although he had done no serious studies in Cambridge, he was acclaimed as one who had been engaged in research in English literature there; so much so that in less than two months, he was already "famed for his great talent" in the capital.(32) He was soon invited by the Literary Society of Tsing Hua College to give a talk by the end of 1922.(33) To the surprise of the audience, however, Hsü announced on the platform that he was going to deliver "a lecture in the Oxford manner" and, instead of using Chinese, he spoke in English.(34) The reason why he did this seemed to be nothing but showing off, or a means of enhancing his fame as one who had done research in English literature in Cambridge.(35) None the less, the "lecture" was significant in that it shed light on Hsü's ideas of art and life he acquired in Europe and also revealed the standard of his English which was said to be the highest in China.(36) The title of the "lecture", "Art and Life",(37) was exactly the same as that of an essay by his friend Roger Fry though the word "art" used by the latter was chiefly confined to fine arts whereas that used by the former was of a comprehensive nature. Moreover, Hsü's approach to his subject was comparable to Fry's.(38) He started off with a general historical survey of Chinese art, in the order of music, fine arts, drama, architecture, dance and poetry, and imputed its poverty and stagnation to the Chinese traditional philosophical system.(39) He said, "We [the Chinese] have

no art precisely because we have no life",[40] and also, "poverty of life necessarily begets poverty of art".[41] By this he meant that art was a superstructure of life. Here his idea was just the opposite of Roger Fry's.[42]

Having painted a dismal picture of almost all that was Chinese in terms of art, Hsü turned to praise the west. He singled out the Hellenic culture and the Renaissance spirit as models for his compatriots to look to and concluded with a long quotation from Walter Pater's "Conclusion".

In Hsü's "lecture", utterances like "life itself should be treated as a piece of art", "Life as a work of art", etc.[43] seemed to be direct borrowings from Edward Carpenter who in his "The Art of Life" harped on "Life as an Art" and "Life is Art".[44] Carpenter maintained that one must fully and boldly express oneself in order to live a life as an art; and he stressed again and again the word "expression" as an equivalent to "expansion".[45] Hsü did not use these words, but employed some other expressions to the similar effect: "Therefore, enrich, augment, multiply, intensify and above all spiritualize your life and art will come of itself."[46] In general, Hsü was quite near Carpenter as far as the Rousseauesque idea of "expansion" is concerned. Although he did not elaborate on the important aspect of how to spiritualize, it was fairly clear from the context that it meant observing and experiencing intensely in life, or, as he quoted Walter Pater, "to burn always with the hard gemlike flame, to maintain this ecstasy ..."[47] He enthroned his "perfect critic Walter Pater"[48] and enshrined his philosophy of life. He certainly thought that if a man could follow Pater's advice, or rather commandment since he later called Pater's "Conclusion" his Bible,[49] he

would lead a life like Goethe's, which was an "accomplished work of art ... full of beautiful mysteries, and mysterious beauties."(50)

After "Art and Life" Hsü gave another talk, again in English, on "Personal Impressions of H. G. Wells, Edward Carpenter and Katherine Mansfield" at Wen-yu hui (文友會) (Literary Friends' Society).(51)

Liang Shih-ch'iu affirmed that Hsü's first talk was a failure.(52) Hsü himself afterwards condemned both the first and the second talks as being "hateful".(53) One reason for these labours in vain may have been his written English style which was apparently an imitation of Walter Pater, or perhaps more directly of the manner of Thomas Hardy's "Apology" which introduced the collection Late Lyrics and Earlier. This volume of Hardy's was published in 1922 while Hsü was still in England. The occasional archaism, the long and involved sentences, and the display of great names were particularly conspicuous in both the master and the disciple. Victorian in essense, this kind of English would have "frightened" any student in China at that time and would have taxed the patience of the Chinese audience to the utmost. Even Liang Shih-ch'iu, a senior among the students, found it hard to follow the talk during its progress(54) whereas the scholar, if present at all, would have deplored the fact that an ordinary unscholarly talk should have been given in the scholarly "Oxford manner". Another reason for the failure of the first "lecture" may have been the "lecturer" 's subtle air of superiority and strongly didactic tone. Furthermore, whether his wholesale condemnation of traditional Chinese values won him any whole-hearted sympathy was doubtful. The members of the Literary Society who shared many of their lao ta-ko (老大哥) (big brother) Wen I-to's views would not have

accepted Hsü's message without a murmur.(55)

After the first two "lectures" Hsü continued to be invited to give talks in different places; however, he seemed to have grown wiser and no longer spoke in English, and he also shed most of his pretensions, including the "Oxford manner".(56)

In 1923 Hsü Chih-mo taught summer school at Nankai College in company with his mentor Liang Ch'i-ch'ao. His lectures were appreciated not because there was much scholarship in them but because the lecturer was an eloquent story teller and the information he imparted was new in China.(57) His lectures may be summarized under three headings: (1) An attack on Chinese traditional moral values; (2)An exposition of his own methods of literary studies; and (3) An introduction of his favourite books and their authors. Under point one Hsü censured both Confucius and Lao Tzu; but, not being a student of philosophy, he did not have much to say. Under point two he emphasized the importance of learning the lives of all great writers, the historical background of the literary works concerned, the stories of Greek mythology, and an education in the arts in general. He especially advocated the reader's identification with the hero or heroine in a book. Under point three he commended some literary works: Walter Pater's Renaissance, the Holy Bible, Dickinson's Letters from John Chinaman, Goethe's Faust, Shakespeare's and Ruskin's works, and also some children's stories. He mentioned Edmund Gosse, Edward Dowden and others as reliable biographers, and Oscar Wilde, Bernard Shaw, John Galsworthy, and J. M. Synge as remarkable playwrights. He called Thomas Hardy the greatest living writer at that time and also praised Joseph Conrad and H. G. Wells. He also included Lord Macaulay, Romain Rolland et al in his lectures. Oddly enough, he said

hardly anything about the poetry of Shelley, Keats and others though he touched on their letters. It was a general and poorly organized survey of English literature with non-English elements; its worth only lay in the information it gave about Hsü's general knowledge and some of his literary idiosyncrasies.

It is doubtful whether such lectures as Hsü's could qualify a man as lecturer in English literature. But perhaps they were as good as could be expected in a university summer school in China at that time. Hsü Chih-mo assumed, at any rate, a "professorship" in the National University of Peking beginning from the autumn of 1924. He did not seem to teach there long - at most up to March, 1925.(58) From 1927 to the end of his life he taught at various institutions in Shanghai and Nanking.(59) He endeared himself to many of his students just as his literary associate Wen I-to did by virtue of his personal charms like frankness, cordiality and brotherly affection.(60) His fairly wide general knowledge of the lives of many great writers, his poetical eloquence, and his fame as a creative writer may also have contributed to his success (as measured strictly by his popularity) as a teacher. However, it would seem that his teaching, unlike that of Wen I-to, was not based on any solid scholarship, and was evidently not free from his personal fantasy.(61)

C. Relations with people.

1. The Creation Society.

Hsü came to know the members of Ch'uang-tsao she (創造社) (The Creation Society) through his old classmate Yü Ta-fu shortly after he returned to China from England.(62) Even if it had not been for the introduction of Yü, his admiration for Walter Pater and especially his quotation of Pater's words: "the love of art for art's sake" in the conclusion of his first "lecture" were substantial enough for him to establish an immediate link between himself and Kuo Mo-jo and Ch'eng Fang-wu (成仿吾) (1888-). Hsü's "Art and Life" was published in Ch'uang-tsao chi-k'an (創造季刊) (Creation Quarterly);(63) thus started his literary association with the Creation Society and also his entanglement in a feud that involved Hu Shih, Liang Shih-ch'iu and this particular Society. This episode, oddly enough, has never been fully investigated in histories of modern Chinese literature. Its complexity was due to the ups and downs of personal relationships; different political views and family and educational backgrounds; and human weaknesses such as jealousy, bitterness, pride and even paranoia. As all the people concerned seemed to be disgusted with their past "brotherhood", they avoided mentioning it in their writings afterwards; and most literary historians are apparently not fully aware of its existence.(64) In the case of Hsü Chih-mo's literary activities and affinities, this was quite an event and must not be let pass unquestioned.

In order to gain a deeper insight into this episode, it would be profitable to start from the relationship between the Chinese returned student groups.

The privileged class in China after the abolition

of the traditional civil service examination system in 1906 was no longer the old-fashioned literati but the returned students who received their advanced studies abroad. Of them the Anglo-American group enjoyed the greatest prestige though they were fewer in number. As a rule they occupied higher positions and received better pay than those educated in Japan or even in other European countries.(65) The Japanese group were relatively large in number. Generally speaking, their English was not good enough to enable them to secure a government scholarship for study in America or Britain, or their families were not rich enough to send them to the west. Since Japan was a country that had defeated China in 1895 and afterwards chose to humiliate the Chinese in various ways, there the sensitive souls among the Chinese students inevitably suffered from a sense of humiliation. Perhaps it is no exaggeration to say that all of them would, whenever feeling depressed and sad, have groaned like Kuo Mo-jo who said:

> I am really out of favour with Time. How unfortunate! I have wanted to fly higher recently - wishing to flee to the west. It is a pity that I have no money. I am not free. Alas!(66)

The pent-up bitterness and rebellion, which constituted part of the mental make-up of many returned students from Japan, were a psychological "gift" the country of the rising sun accorded to her near neighbour; small wonder that many of the returned students back from Japan became revolutionaries in one way or another. Once home again, they immediately felt the superiority of the Anglo-American group,who, quite innocently, saddled them with an inferiority complex which often nourished bitterness, aggressiveness and

pride, but also depression, anxiety and self-pity in a number of cases. Viewed in this perspective, the refusal of the members of the Creation Society to join the Wen-hsüeh yen-chiu hui (文學研究會) (The Literary Association)[67] was no surprise although the latter was by no means an exclusive organization of the Anglo-American group.[68] In fact Kuo Mo-jo and his comrades in the early twenties would have hated to join any literary society of which they were not the founders and in which they would not have the glamour of being leaders. In the field of literature they were keen on asserting themselves and on attacking others. To launch an attack, the easiest way was to find faults in others' translations, and such targets were not hard to come by since many Chinese translators at that time did not have a firm grasp of the foreign languages they dealt with.[69] The trouble Hsü Chih-mo underwent in connection with the Creation Society happened against this background and originated in Yü Ta-fu's criticism of Yü Chia-chü (余家菊)'s[70] translation and Hu Shih's subsequent exposure of Yü Ta-fu's inadequate understanding of the English original. Hu Shih in his comments slashed not only Yü Ta-fu but also the Creation Society as a whole, finding them "shallow and frivolous without knowing it". Yü Ta-fu felt so desperately humiliated that he, as reported, almost wanted to commit suicide. Being strong in fraternal spirit, Kuo Mo-jo and Ch'eng Fang-wu defended their brother Yü and criticized Hu Shih's translation in return.[71] Thus a feud between Hu Shih and the Creation Society was born, and his Nu-li chou-pao (努力週報) (The Endeavour Weekly) was looked on as an enemy publication by Kuo and his friends. A few months later when Hsü Chih-mo returned from Europe, this literary upheaval had already subsided, but not the hatred.

Hsü became acquainted with Hu Shih a little later than he got in touch with the Creation Society people.(72) At first he was apparently on more cordial terms with the latter for, after all, Yü Ta-fu was his old friend and he and the Creation Society members embraced more or less the same tenets in literary creation -romanticism and aestheticism. The letter Hsü wrote to Ch'eng Fang-wu on 21st March, 1923 could almost be regarded as an application for membership:

> I have long been cherishing admiration for all the distinguished gentlemen of your Scoeity. When I was still abroad, I used to feel disgusted with the shallowness of the recent writings done in pai-hua; but as soon as I read Mo-jo's poems I was surprisingly impressed and became aware of the striking appearance of the hidden spirit of us Chinese. Now having made friends with all of you, I am glad that I can count you as comrades. How can I not do my best to follow you, and to open up new ground [in the field of literature] with you? Your literary criticism is right and judicious, free from prejudice. This is a rare thing to-day. I do hope that you will keep it up diligently, thus establishing order [where there was none before].(73)

The same letter also revealed that Ch'eng Fnag-wu had written to Hsü previously, praising him, and had asked him to translate Walter Pater.

Later on, Hsü in another letter even went so far as to flatter Ch'eng indirectly by jibing at his mentor Liang Ch'i-ch'ao's supporter Chang Tung-sun (張東蓀) and he also expressed his wish to see his second talk, i.e. "Personal Impressions of H. G. Wells, Edward Carpenter and Katherine Mansfield" published in the Creation Quarterly.(74) But then an abrupt change took place: Hsü in his essay "Tsa-chi" (雜記) (Random Notes), which appeared in the

Endeavour Weekly soon afterwards,(75) ridiculed an expression in a poem by Kuo Mo-jo without mentioning Kuo's name. He labelled the poem obliquely as "fake poetry".(76) Ch'eng Fang-wu, always impulsive, flared up. He published an open rejoinder together with Hsü's previous letters in Creation Quarterly and accused Hsü of wearing a double face and playing a deep game.(77) Hsü's reply in Ch'en-pao fu-k'an (晨報副刊) (The Supplement to the Peking Morning Post) bore indignation, dignity, irony as well as sincerity. He explained that he had used Kuo's verse only for illustration, and re-affirmed his friendliness towards the Creation Society and also other people who were genuinely interested in literature. On the other hand, he maintained that that particular poem of Kuo was an inferior product and complained against Ch'eng's publishing his private letters without his permission.(78) These communications intrigued Liang Shih-ch'iu who at that time was still a student at Tsing Hua College. Liang had been associated with the Creation Society for sometime but was no friend of Hu Shih or Hsü Chih-mo.(79) He wrote a long letter to Ch'eng Fang-wu on 12th June, deploring Hsü's criticism of Kuo Mo-jo but, posing as an unbiased judge, he also pointed out Ch'eng's impulsiveness in certain things. He also took the opportunity to rail at Hu Shih's Endeavour Weekly since he had a grudge against a man who criticized him in that magazine.(80) After that Hsü kept silent, and he did not have the heart to continue his unfinished "Random Notes". He learned a lesson. His name no longer appeared in any of the publications bearing the name Creation. His honeymoon with the Creation Society was very short indeed. Nevertheless, a few months later he and Hu Shih made an effort to foster some sort of

friendship with the Creation Society people. They paid a visit to them in Shanghai and their gesture was construed by Kuo Mo-jo as "an attitude of sueing for peace".(81) Although the visit was reciprocated, and some warm feeling was manifested, and they even later entertained one another in restaurants,(82) the strain somehow remained; collaboration was out of the question.

In October, 1925 when Hsü took up the editorship of the Supplement to the Peking Morning Post, he invited many writers including Kuo Mo-jo to contribute,(83) but the latter did not seem to appreciate Hsü's kindness. He must have thought it discreditable for himself, already a declared Marxist upholding revolutionary literature, to support a "reactionary" newspaper like the Peking Morning Post.

Then in 1928, Kuo Mo-jo started criticizing Hsü harshly, calling him the "literary clown of the Research Clique", and branding his writing as "positive and intentional counter-revolutionary literature".(84) After the establishment of the People's Republic of China, Kuo continued to disparage Hsü, as could have been predicted.(85)

Although an admirer of Kuo Mo-jo's pai-hua verse in the beginning, Hsü began to change his attitude by April, 1923, and after half a year, he deplored the signs of "regression" he detected in Kuo's poems.(86) Even if he had not written the "Random Notes", he could not have kept up his brotherly relations with the Creation Society too long, for he could no longer find them congenial to him when they started adopting a leftist approach to literature in 1924.

The only member of the Creation Society who could be counted as a friend of Hsü was Yü Ta-fu. Yü called himself "an ardent sympathizer with his [Hsü's] fate".(87) Their friendship was understandable since, firstly, Yü Ta-fu was essentially not a political

revolutionary; nor was he intellectually convinced of the "truth" of Marxism.(88) Secondly, he and Hsü were temperamentally of the same romantic type though Hsü appeared to be more of an extravert. Thirdly, they shared a similar fate in their love life. Fourthly, as mentioned before, they were old classmates. Yü Ta-fu maintained a warm friendship with Hsü and also Hsü's friends especially after 1927 when they were together in Shanghai. Hsü was ready to help him when Yü and the Creation Society began to face trouble from the government.(89) Shortly before he returned to Peking to resume teaching at the National University, i.e. just before he met his death in November, 1931, Hsü asked Yü in a letter to join the Chinese P.E.N. and also solicited him on behalf of Chung-hua shu-chü (中華書局) (Chung-hua Book Co.) as well as Hsin-yüeh shu-tien (新月書店) (Crescent Moon Book Co.) for the right to publish some of his books.(90) On account of all this intercourse, Yü Ta-fu, of all the Creation Society members, was the only person to mourn Hsü Chih-mo and to write on him after his death.(91) In 1936, he wrote in memory of Hsü again, feelingly and sadly, being conscious of himself, like Shelley, as "A phantom among men, companionless .../ Who in another's fate now wept his own."(92) Of course it must be noted that Yü Ta-fu, while a founding member of the Creation Society, did not dream the identical dream with the other members after 1925(93) in spite of a number of essays he wrote on "revolutionary" subjects.(94)

As to Hsü Chih-mo's criticism of Kuo Mo-jo's verse that led to his break with the Creation Society, it would seem that Hung Wei-fa's (洪為法) and Liang Shih-ch'iu's verdict was essentially just and Hsü himself was to blame.(95) The occasion that caused the composition of the poem was a very sad one and Hsü, evidently ignorant of

the background, ridiculed Kuo irresponsibly.(96) The expression "lei-lang t'ao-t'ao" (淚浪滔滔) (surging waves of tears) may not be of great poetic excellence but the poem could scarcely be branded as "fake poetry" because of it.(97)

2. Lu Hsün.

If Hsü Chih-mo's contact with Kuo Mo-jo, Ch'eng Fang-wu and others eventually turned out to be unpleasant, his experience with Lu Hsün (魯迅) was a thing of repugnance through and through. This was an entirely unexpected blow to Hsü who at first had some warm feeling towards Lu Hsün and called him "a friend" - a fact made known to Arthur Waley in a letter written by Hsü on 21st February, 1924:

> A friend of ours recently published his book The Outline History of Chinese Fiction (by Lu Hsün). Quite good. I'll buy one and send it to you.(98)

In the same letter Hsü expressed a political attitude corresponding to what Lu Hsün often demonstrated in his tsa-kan (雜感) (miscellaneous) essays; Hsü wrote:

> The present state of affairs is such a sordid mess, and the lower passions of human nature are holding such sway, that the only job left to the idealist seems to be no other than designing the most biting of satirical weapons to combat things with ...

When Yü Szu (語絲) (Small Talks), initiated by Chou Tso-jen (周作人)(1885-1966?), Lu Hsün, Sun Fu-yüan (孫伏園), Lin Yutang (林語堂) et al, made its first appearance on 17th November, 1924, Hsü must have hailed its birth, for he offered his support by contributing to it. His contribution, a translated poem by Baudelaire with a prologue by Hsü himself, was published in the third issue of that magazine.(99) But the goodwill was soon shattered when Lu Hsün's satire entitled "Yin-yüeh" (音樂) (Music), which was aimed at the prologue, appeared.(100) On reading the magazine in Paris, Liu Fu (劉復), or Liu Pan-nung (劉半農), at once wrote an essay joining with Lu Hsün to ridicule Hsü; he wrote more afterwards, and some other people also added their voices to the hue and cry.(101) However, Lu Hsün played the game with more zest and energy than any others. His hatred towards Hsü was exceptional. But why? Lu Hsün himself furnished the answer:

> Actually I don't like writing pai-hua poetry (nor classical poetry ...).I dislike particularly that kind of verse written by Hsü Chih-mo. But he was just keen on making contributions to different magazines. As soon as the Small Talks appeared, he came. Some people supported him, and so his article was published. Because of this I wrote an impromptu piece to tease him, and to shut him out. And indeed, he stopped coming. This was my first action that paved the way to my future feud with the Hsin-yüeh [(新月)] group. Owing to this, a few colleagues in Small Talks Society also had a grudge against me.(102)

From this confession Lu Hsün made it clear that his attack on Hsü Chih-mo originated from his dislike for the latter's verse generally. But if this had been the sole reason, Lu Hsün should also have "shut out" Li Chin-fa (李金髮)

who contributed to Small Talks symbolist poems which most people condemned in the early twenties in China.(103) It would seem that as far as Hsü's piece of writing is concerned, what offended Lu Hsün and others was not so much the translated poem that smacked of the "Fleus du mal" as the prologue to the poem. In it Hsü stressed that music could be heard and appreciated anywhere and under any circumstances, implying the Keatsian idea "Heard melodies are sweet, but those unheard / Are sweeter ..." which was also echoed by Hsü's spiritual mentor Tagore.(104) This message was not particularly offensive; Kuo Mo-jo put forward the same idea without incurring any protest.(105) What nettled Lu Hsün and his associates must have been Hsü's naive flaunting of his own exquisite sensibility to music and at the same time his deploring of the insensibility to music of many other people. He did not mean to underrate any particular person, and his childlike bragging would not have seriously jarred on the other Small Talks members like Chou Tso-jen and Lin Yutang who, with a sense of humour, would have treated the whole thing as a child's bumptiousness and yelling, and said (as Chou Tso-jen did say) something like:

> Chih-mo ... has his mannerisms. Perhaps some shortcomings too ... But even these ... are just like a mole on a man's face ... They make others nod and smile, but do not cause any disgust.(106)

But Lu Hsün, an educated man from the eastern part of Chekiang province(107) who once said, "I personally am always aware of the presence of venom and malice in my soul";(108) and who was convinced that "The duty of a writer is to react to and struggle against all evils

immediately";[109] could scarcely bear what he loathed. He thought it his duty to nip it in the bud. Lu Hsün's intolerance was obvious,[110] but that Hsü Chih-mo's presentation of his idea could sound unpleasant to others too was undeniable.

After this first piece, the Small Talks brought out another translated poem by Hsü, i.e. Hardy's "In the Restaurant".[111] Then Hsü's name disappeared for good from the Small Talks. Apparently the latter translation was sent to the editor(s) of the magazine either together with the first article or anyway before Lu Hsün's attack which made Hsü recoil. To create an enemy simply by penning a few incautious remarks must have had a dazing effect on Hsü. Although he was eager to make friends, he made enemies one after another. Life was ironical.

3. Other writers.

But fortunately not all the people were as uncongenial as Lu Hsün. Lin Yutang, a friend of Lu Hsün's, was also Hsü Chih-mo's friend and even admirer,[112] and was most probably one of the few Small Talks people who supported the publication of Hsü's article in their magazine. Then there were some members of the Literary Association like Cheng Chen-to (鄭振鐸), Wang T'ung-chao (王統照) and Ch'ü Chü-nung (瞿菊農) or Ch'ü Shih-ying (瞿世英) whose friendship Hsü appreciated.[113]

In the more intimate circle, Ch'en Yüan must be included.[114] Hsü and Ch'en admired and even flattered each other[115] and their intimacy undoubtedly made Hsü even more detestable to the Small Talks people - notably

Lu Hsün and Liu Fu, since both of them hated Ch'en Yüan.

Hsü and Ch'en were often together in Peking before 1927, and both were the founding members of the Hsin-yüeh she (新月社) (Crescent Moon Society). But Ch'en soon became disillusioned with literature after some polemics with Lu Hsün and Chou Tso-jen. Later when Hsü and others started the Hsin-yüeh yüeh-k'an (新月月刊) (Crescent Moon Monthly) in Shanghai, Ch'en's support was negligible though he and Hsü were always good friends.

4. Liang Ch'i-ch'ao.

In Hsü Chih-mo's life, Liang Ch'i-ch'ao was decidedly an influential personality. Hsü's education acquired in the west did not weaken his belief that Liang was the greatest living scholar in China in those days, and that even Hu Shih could not stand comparison with him.(116) Upon the death of the savant in 1929, Hsü wrote to L. K. Elmhirst thus:

> ... he [Liang] is a much greater man than any of his contemporaries, not excepting Dr. Sun, in so far as in him we not only find the perfect scholar but also the man who alone is worthy of the great traditions of Chinese civilization. As for the part he played in ushering in a new era for modern China, in effecting through one man's effort a complete mental revolution without which the last political one would have been impossible, his place is truly unique in modern records.(117)

After Hsü's return from Europe, the first person to whom he paid respects outside his family circle was

probably Liang Ch'i-ch'ao. He followed his master to hear lectures given by a lay Buddhist scholar in Nanking; he also promised to translate Liang's Hsien-Ch'in cheng-chih szu-hsiang shih (先秦政治思想史) (A History of Political Thought in the Pre-Ch'in Period) into English.(118) However, he soon came into conflict with his master over his divorce. Liang was not in sympathy with him although the matter was already past. In a letter to Hsü the older man hinted at the disciple's wrongs committed against the latter's wife, children and both families concerned.(119) Hsü in reply defended himself vigorously:

> The fact that I have been struggling with all my might against the world is not only for the relief of an excruciating pain but also for the ease of conscience; it is for the independence of personality and for the salvation of soul.
>
> .....
>
> O my Master! I have exhausted my whole soul in order to bring into the world an ideal pearl and to cultivate it with all my burning and bubbling heart, hoping that it will illumine the innermost cell of my spirit's mansion. But the vulgar people are hostile to and jealous of me, never ceasing their attempts to benumb my soul and defile my purity.(120)

He also announced his determination to seek his "soul's companion" and concluded: "If I succeed, I am fortunate. If I fail, it is destiny."(121) This strong wording in the letter almost amounted to a reproof to Liang Ch'i-ch'ao and an explicit defiance to his exhortation. Liang did not appear to take offence, but he washed his hands of the matter once and for all.

Some critics asserted that Liang Ch'i-ch'ao's real aim in his letter of exhortation to Hsü was to stop the latter from pursuing Lin Hui-yin whom Liang had designated as his future daughter-in-law.(122) Although it was not impossible that Liang did bear his son and the girl in mind when writing the letter, it would seem pushing the matter too far to treat Liang's intention as a purely selfish one. Without any substantial evidence to support such an assertion, perhaps it is safer to say that Liang's intention was a mixed one; for Liang was indeed fond of Hsü and did wish to see him leading a peaceful and happy life with Chang Yu-i.(123)

Liang Ch'i-ch'ao since 1918 had devoted himself to scholarship and cultural activities.(124) He was anxious to keep Hsü as a sort of right-hand man. When he was planning to re-organize Shih-shih hsin pao (時事新報) (The China Times) in March, 1923, he hoped to have Hsü as one of the editors to take charge of the literary supplement of the paper.(125) Although this scheme was abortive, Liang managed to keep Hsü in his Sung-p'o (松坡) Library as English Secretary and took him to Nankai College to teach summer school with him that year.(126) Liang also assigned Hsü the job of "liason officer" in corresponding with Tagore and for all arrangements of the latter's visit to China.(127)

Hsü Chih-mo was often in company with Liang Ch'i-ch'ao especially in the first half of 1923.(128) In the spring that year, an intellectual controversy broke out between Chang Chün-mai and Ting Wen-chiang(丁文江) which became known afterwards as the "Controversy over the philosophy of life". This pi-chan (筆戰) ("pen-war") lasted several months and involved over twenty Chinese intellectuals including Hu Shih, Ch'en Tu-hsiu, Wu Chih-hui (吳稚暉) and others. Liang Ch'i-ch'ao found it

awkward to comment at first since both Chang Chün-mai and Ting Wen-chiang were his admirers and followers of a sort. After a few weeks, however, fearing a breach of friendship might occur between Chang and Ting, he tried to act as a peace-maker.(129) Hsü Chih-mo, accompanying Liang here and there, was silent throughout the "warring period". He may have felt unqualified to utter anything about philosophy, but on the other hand, his unpleasant experience with the Creation Society being fresh in his mind, he must have found it distasteful to take sides in any controversy, even if he had had something to say.

The master and the disciple co-operated splendidly during Tagore's visit to China in 1924; but a second conflict emerged in no time between them. It again concerned Hsü's love life - this time with Lu Hsiao-man. Liang denounced Hsü's attachment to a married woman, especially as it was Mrs. Wang Keng. Undaunted by Hsü's rebuttal to his admonition only about a year before, Liang remonstrated with Hsü repeatedly against the affair.(130) He also appeared to have helped financially to set Hsü on his journey to Europe in 1925,(131) obviously wishing that with a radical change of environment, his favourite disciple would gain wisdom enough to forget Lu Hsiao-man.

To Liang Ch'i-ch'ao's earnest advice Hsü Chih-mo turned a deaf ear; but later in 1926 he had to implore his master to be witness at his marriage with Hsiao-man since his father would not approve it without Liang's presence there. Liang turned down the wilful young man's humble request; but eventually, because of the intercessions of Hu Shih and Chang P'eng-ch'un (張彭春), he reluctantly agreed to go on condition that he should be given the chance to reprove the bride and the bridegroom publicly at the ceremony. And so the reproof, in the form of a

pedagogic speech, took place, to the embarrassment of Hsü Chih-mo and Lu Hsiao-man and the astonishment of all the guests. It was "a wedding unheard of in or outside China in the past or in the modern time".(132) In Liang's opinion, Hsü had been "sinking in the sea" owing to his affair with Lu Hsiao-man, and their marriage might be the beginning of perpetual misery to Hsü and might even lead him to an untimely death.(133) Liang Ch'i-ch'ao's paternal affection for Hsü Chih-mo was quite moving, and his ominous prophecy, unfortunately, turned out to be reality in a few years' time.

During the last period of his life, i.e. 1927-31, Hsü was mostly in Shanghai. His relations with Liang Ch'i-ch'ao seemed to be less intimate. The unhappiness brought about by his second marriage justified Liang's advice given to him only a few years before. The truth of the master's words may have plagued his mind and discouraged him from writing to Liang, but his reverence for him did not appear to abate. He made a special trip to Peking to inquire after Liang's health shortly before the intellectual giant of modern China died on 19th January, 1929.(134)

Both Liang Ch'i-ch'ao and Hsü Chih-mo were temperamentally of the same type. Their emotionalism shone through in their works. It was perhaps the master's overwhelming patriotism that first attracted the disciple's attention when the latter, still a teenager, came to appreciate the older man's writings. Apart from the early influence as touched upon in the preceding pages, Hsü throughout his life was politically in consonance with Liang, opposing violence and upholding parliamentary democracy. Liang Ch'i-ch'ao's philosophy of life, a combination of Buddhism and Confucianism as defined by himself,(135) seemed to be foreign to Hsü who would never

admit that he was in any way in favour of a religion or a philosophy as reactionary in the eyes of the young people of his days as Confucianism. But it is noteworthy that Hsü was religious in his own ways[136] and his condemnation of Confucianism was chiefly aimed at its utilitarianism and morality.[137] As for his wish to save China and his idea about a son's duty towards his parents, they were respectively rooted in Confucian political thought and filial piety.[138] Sincerity in helping younger people and cordiality towards all were seen in Liang and Hsü, and both "loved literature and loved friends".[139] The permanent influence of Liang on Hsü appeared to be threefold. First, the Confucian élitism. Although Hsü no longer cherished the idea of "hsüeh erh yu tse shih" (學而優則仕) (one should apply oneself to become an official on completion of one's studies)[140] after his Cambridge days and indeed stood aloof from practical political involvement, he was never disenchanted from a conviction of his own mission in life. In his late teens and early twenties, the mission was to become a great statesman to serve his country;[141] after the western experience, it seemed to be more vague, but it remained with him. He "hated to be ordinary"; saw himself to be among the élite; and always had a battle to fight and a noble image to live up to.[142] Now he was to shoulder the responsibility of destroying the arranged marriage system and breaking new ground in poetry on the social and literary fronts respectively. In all his activities, there was something he desired to convey so as to enlighten the world, or at least the Chinese.[143] Secondly, the approach to literature. Liang in his influential article "On the Relationship between Fiction and the Guiding of the People", which

was of special significance to Hsü,[144] advocated the importance of the reader's identification with the hero of a novel.[145] After more than twenty years, he again said something to the same effect.[146] This romantic approach to literature Hsü Chih-mo swallowed whole. As mentioned above, he passed it on to his students;[147] and in his life, he practised it. Thirdly, the writing style. In this respect the merits and demerits of Liang were also Hsü's. It had its charm, vigour and power of persuasion; but some features of this particular emotive style, such as parallelism and repetition, as pointed out by Hu Shih, were often flaws.[148] Although they might be suitable vesture for strong feelings, their frequent appearance could do harm to an otherwise good style. Both Hsü's poetry and his prose were to some extent marred by parallelism and repetition. It may be said that Liang Ch'i-ch'ao's adverse influence was at work there.

D. The complexity of the "Crescent Moon".

In modern Chinese literature nothing seems more confusing than people and activities related to the name Hsin-yüeh (新月) (Crescent moon).[149] In terminology, the reader meets with Hsin-yüeh chi (新月集) (The Crescent Moon, i.e. Tagore's collection of poems), Hsin-yüeh she (新月社) (Crescent Moon Society), Hsin-yüeh p'ai (新月派) (Crescent Moon School, or Crescent Moon Clique), Hsin-yüeh shu-tien (新月書店) (Crescent Moon Book Co.), and Hsin-yüeh yüeh-k'an (新月月刊) (Crescent Moon Monthly). The first appelation causes little trouble. Confusion generally surrounds the terms "Crescent Moon Society" and "Crescent Moon School", or "Crescent Moon Clique". As for Crescent Moon Book Co. and Crescent Moon Monthly, they are, as mere names, clearly self-explanatory; but they can hardly escape from a literary snare when the Crescent Moon Society and/or the Crescent Moon School (or Clique) are involved. As this literary scene has long been shrouded in a lingering fog of obscurity, it is high time to dispel it before proceeding further in the discussion of Hsü Chih-mo. For this purpose it is essential to look at a part of the social scene of Peking in the early 1920's.

If min i shih wei t'ien (民以食為天) (the people consider eating their god) can be regarded as an expression of part of the Chinese "national quintessence" as a cup of tea is in England, a good illustration of it can be found in Peking in the 1920's. There and then several kinds of "eating societies" under different names thrived. The first of such societies emerged as sheng-jih hui (生日會) (birthday society) among government officials and wealthy merchants. Then there

was the chü-ch'an hui (聚餐會) (dining society) - a creation first by the members of parliament who held it in their own clubs once a week on Saturday or Sunday evenings. These societies were for the object of friendship and comradeship, with a strong political orientation. The dining society, however, soon spread to the professional people. The most hilarious group among them was the university teachers, particularly the returned students educated in the west who added flavour to their parties "with their college yells, songs and jokes". Whereas they would frequent restaurants, they sometimes would for a change have a picnic outside the city. Later when the railmen, postmen, shop assistants, and others caught up with the fashion, the less expensive "street corner restaurants" catered for their needs. There was still another kind of "eating society" called hsiao-han hui (消寒會) (chill-killing society) which was mainly the enjoyment of the literati who brought food with them from their homes and shared it together mostly in a tea-ship or a temple, and sometimes in a park, but seldom in a restaurant.(150)

Hsü Chih-mo formed a dining society for the literary people in Peking in 1923. What made him take the initiative must have been his liking for social gatherings and his natural gift for organization; but there might have been other reasons: first, in 1923 he was not a happy man on account of his failure in love. He would sometimes shut himself up in a room and weep,(151) as emotional people in his circumstances often do. However, he was not the kind of person who would bemoan his fate and allow himself to succumb to sorrow and depression. He would find some means to relieve his feeling. To be actively engaged in a dining society certainly helped.

Secondly, he believed in the value of friendhsip and the promotion of kindly feelings, and a dining society was an effective way to achieve these ends. Thirdly, he was desirous of running a magazine,(152) and a dining society would facilitate the establishment of contact with other people. Fourthly, he might have wished to find a girl friend or some girl friends after being jilted by Lin Hui-yin.

How successful this dining society was is not clear, but its development can be seen in Hsü's own words:

> ... the very beginning was a dining society, which gave birth to the Crescent Moon Society, which in turn gave birth to the Club at No. seven ... (153)

Here we see that the "dining society" was the predecessor of the Crescent Moon Society. More light is thrown on Hsü's aim and the relationship between the Society and the "Club at No. seven" in an open letter by Hsü which, curiously enough, has hitherto never been cited in any writings dealing with this subject:

> An organization is material. An ideal is invisible. The beginning of the Crescent Moon was only the common aspiration of a few individuals. At that time it was merely a name, and we can say that it was not a close blood relation to the present Club of the Crescent Moon Society of No. seven ... What was our aspiration? Of course it was the fancy of a few book-worms! We wanted to stage plays ... written and performed by ourselves ... (154)

In another paragraph he declared that the Crescent Moon people, or rather himself, desired to "lu leng-chiao" (露稜角) (demonstrate formidable ability).(155) He referred to D. G. Rossetti and his Pre-Raphaelite brethren, and also to Bernard Shaw and his associates, implying that his ultimate objective was not only to influence the literary and artistic circles but to bring new life to the fields of ideology and politics. He repeated his words emphatically: "It is a shame not to demonstrate [our] formidable ability! " (156)

Strictly speaking, the Crescent Moon Society known to the outside world was not really the one of Hsü's hope, but was the "Club of Crescent Moon Society of No. seven". The one was an ideal and the other, an organization.

As to the dating of the Society, if one insists that a society is not one without its office house together with a prpper sign hung outside, one will have to conclude that the Crescent Moon Society was founded only after Tagore's departure, since No. seven was not acquired earlier than that time.(157) However, if one sides with Hsü Chih-mo in accepting that society is a society after a name is adopted and membership and activities are started irrespective of the existence or non-existence of a society office or club house, then one must agree that the Crescent Moon Society was founded, however infomally, when the rehearsal of Tagore's play "Chitra" began. Evidence has it that even before the performance of the play on Tagore's sixty-fourth birthday (8th May, 1924), the name Crescent Moon Society already appeared in both Chinese and English in Pei-ching ch'en pao (北京晨報) (Peking Morning Post) and probably also in other newspapers.(158)

Further, it seems more likely that the formation of the Society took place before rather than during Tagore's visit, since as early as October, 1923, Hsü already proposed to stage a play by Tagore.(159) Indeed, after the latter's arrival, there may not have been much time for Hsü and others to do the necessary rehearsals.

According to Hsü Chih-mo, the staging of "Chitra" by the Crescent Moon members was the most remarkable event of the Society.(160) The fact that some well-educated persons of Peking's high class took part in a theatrical performance was great news to the Chinese in those days when actors, actresses, singers and dancers were still looked down upon as mere entertainers whose social status was not much higher than that of barbers and peddlars. In this respect the Crescent Moon Society was indeed an avant-garde organization whose spirit was also displayed in a rule which raised many eye-brows and distinguished the Society from the ordinary clubs in Peking: it forbade its members to gamble or talk about politics on the Society's premises.(161)

Hsü deplored the fact that after "Chitra" the Crescent Moon Society was unable to stage more plays.(162) In other words, after "Chitra" the activities of the Society did not develop in pursuance of his own plan. Although there had been New Year's party, lantern party, traditional Chinese music appreciation, calligraphy and art exhibition, etc., Hsü considered them only "seasonal entertainments" and "the occasional interests of the members", and were "definitely not the serene light of the crescent moon; not the 'formidable ability' of our imagination". Actually he was not at all happy with the "Club". He declared that if the existence of the Crescent Moon Society was for the entertainment of the wealthy in Peking, he

would be the first person to denounce it.(163) And he did. In a private letter to Lu Hsiao-man he repudiated the activities of the Society in fairly strong terms saying:

> An easy life ruins a man ... if I were to continue my life in the Crescent Moon Society style, I could not help degenerating in less than two years. No lustre would shine at the tip of my pen. No fresh throbbing would exist in my heart. Then it would be the end of me - 'being submerged among others! ' Then ... I might be clowning in the arena of politics - oh, a real shame indeed!(164)

Indeed, there were politicians and bankers in the membership of the Society and they were in fact financially the most important support of the organization.(165) Although these people may not have been all philistines, they were by no means anxious to maintain a high literary and artistic standard of the Society. They seemed to be more keen on billiards, Peking opera and feasting. Instead of being able to make use of their financial support, Hsü somehow found himself being made use of by them. He could not direct the activities as he wished. His protests fell on deaf ears. Then the end! The following words given by Hsü himself in reference to the history of the Society are revealing:

> I can't help recollecting ... my enthusiasm in the inception of the Crescent Moon Society ... in the end it presumably became an 'all unhappy club' ! (166)

Hsü Chih-mo was the executive of the Crescent Moon Society. As soon as he lost interest, all its activities folded. (167) But as a club with its own premises, it continued to exist, if not function, till

1927.[168] Fresh with promise though its start had been, the Society soon died, with few tears shed for it. The only person lamenting was probably Hsü Chih-mo, its creator who, seeing another hope buried, clung to the name Crescent Moon, about which he said:

> We can hardly abandon the name Crescent Moon. For though it is not a particularly strong and powerful symbol, its slender shape clearly implies and indicates a future perfection.[169]

When he and his friends opend their bookstore in Shanghai in 1927, they named it the Crescent Moon Book Company;[170] later in the year when they were planning the publication of a magazine, they, or rather Hsü Chih-mo, christened it the Crescent Moon Monthly.[171] Some of the people involved in the partnership of the bookstore as well as the publication of the monthly were once members of the Crescent Moon Society of Peking, but they were very few indeed; and apart from this, there was absolutely no connection between the Society and the bookstore or the magazine.[172] Of the relationship between these three, a statement in the leading article of the magazine written by Hsü is the best elucidation:

> This monthly magazine is entitled the Crescent Moon neither because there was a Crescent Moon Society, which has already passed away, nor because there is a Crescent Moon Book Company, which is an independent business - its relationship with this magazine is that of printers and publishers. The Crescent Moon Monthly is independent.[173]

Contrary to the generally accepted opinion which is prevalent not only in journalistic writings but in some scholarly works, there was no such organization as

Crescent Moon Society in Shanghai during the period when the Crescent Moon Book Company and the Crescent Moon Monthly were in existence.(174) The Crescent Moon Society, after its quiet death, was never revived.

It is possible that some writers using the term Crescent Moon Society may not be completely unaware of its history. They persist in the use of it assuming that a magazine is generally associated with a she (社) (society). Indeed, in 1920's there were many small literary societies formed by young people for publishing their own magazines. Most of them were just friendly groups, usually rather small, and almost all of them were short-lived.(175) They did not necessarily have an office, let alone a club-house; their meeting place may have been somebody's home or a tea-house, and they seldom bound themselves to strict regulations or rules. Ordinarily, when a certain group started to plan their magazine, they began to call themselves a certain "society". Therefore the publications bearing the name "Creation" were connected with the Creation Society, the Small Talks magazine, with the Small Talks Society, etc.(176) In view of this, one may perhaps loosely dub the people whose names regularly appeared in the Crescent Moon Monthly "the members of the Crescent Moon Society". In fact Hsü Chih-mo himself used the word "society" in this sense when he and others published their Shih-k'an (詩刊) (Poetry Magazine) in 1931 - they called themselves Shih she (詩社) (Poetry Society).(177) But the Crescent Moon Society must be treated as a special case; since there was already a Crescent Moon Society existing in Peking before, confusion is bound to arise when the same name is applied to all of those who were involved in the publication of or contribution to the Crescent Moon Monthly. This muddling, if not a real bother to the better informed

older generation, would be a pitfall to all students of modern Chinese literature that are to come, and should best be avoided. Any equation of the founders of the Crescent Moon Monthly with the members of Crescent Moon Society is historically untrue.

As to the term Hsin-yüeh p'ai, clearly it has two components, i.e. Hsin-yüeh and p'ai. The latter word means p'ai-pieh (派別) (category), p'ai-hsi (派系) (clique), tsung-p'ai (宗派) (sect), hsüeh-p'ai (學派) (school), etc. All these imply a basic idea of group tendency or activity, usually towards a common goal. It follows that Hsin-yüeh p'ai should mean a group of people who embraced the same idea(s) about something or some things and perhaps even worked in harmony under the name of Hsin-yüeh for the realization of it or them. But was there such a group? Tsang K'e-chia (臧克家) commented:

> The term Hsin-yüeh p'ai was derived from the magazine Hsin-yüeh yüeh-k'an which made its first appearance in 1928.(178)

Liang Shih-ch'iu, more heavily involved, had more to say:

> The founders of this magazine were often called by others the Hsin-yüeh p'ai as if they were an organized institution adhering to some [agreed] principles. In fact this is not true.(179)

Then touching on the origin of the term he added:

> Hsin-yüeh p'ai ... was invented by the self-styled leftists; later it was also used by others. Indeed, when this label was fastened, in most cases it showed spiteful feeling.(180)

Liang Shih-ch'iu's repudiation of the term Hsin-yüeh p'ai was based on the assumption that a certain p'ai must rest on a certain formally organized society or political party; of course this is not necessarily so. Organizations and activities associated with the name of Hsin-yüeh were facts, and whether the people involved in them could be denominated a p'ai depended on whether they entertained the same ideas about a serious subject or some subjects in life. Having come to this point, one would probably agree that while it is true that these Hsin-yüeh people were different from one another in many ways and in many things, they were politically, on the whole, supporters of democracy of the western type and opponents of any kind of totalitalianism, whether communistic or nationalistic. And they were reformers rather than revolutionaries. This general political leaning, when made felt in the country, was sufficient to turn the people concerned into a p'ai regardless of their approval or disapproval; therefore Hsin-yüeh p'ai as a name in this respect was not unjustifiable. Of course it was not a pleasing term on account of its possible subtle meaning of cliquism, and this explained its rejection by the Hsin-yüeh people. Another reason for their resentment was their belief in individualism and distaste for any grouping by others. Liang Shih-ch'iu reported that Hu Shih enjoyed repeating the following remark: "Lions and tigers always walk the earth alone; only foxes and dogs live in groups."(181) Such an attitude may be regarded as representative of the Hsin-yüeh people and was comparable to that of the Bloomsbury group in England.(182)

On the other hand, however, the term Hsin-yüeh p'ai in modern Chinese literature is often used

to refer to a school of poetry reputed to be dedicated to poetic forms. Here the word p'ai might be acceptable to all since it simply means a school, or a group of persons who favoured more or less the same ideas about poetry. What seems a little odd is that the name Hsin-yüeh should be attached to this particular p'ai, for actually the poets of this school were by and large not members of the Crescent Moon Society, nor were they significantly involved in the Crescent Moon Monthly or the Crescent Moon Book Company,(183) and the name Hsin-yüeh apparently had no link with their pai-hua regulated poetry that drew them together. Historically, these poets started from a discussion or study group meeting in Wen I-to's house in Peking.(184) Their subsequent activities were contributions to the Shih-k'an (詩刊) (Poetry Magazine) of the Peking Morning Post in 1926. After a few years they, except for a few who had died, emerged again, and together with some new people active under the same banner, they contributed to the Poetry Magazine (Shanghai) in 1931. Some of their names did appear in Crescent Moon Monthly but that was a rather insignificant point since the monthly was not exclusively dedicated to poetry.(185) The strange marriage of Hsin-yüeh and p'ai (as a school of poetry) was largely due to Hsü Chih-mo, a leader of the pai-hua regulated poetry movement, who inherited the name Crescent Moon from Tagore; created the Crescent Moon Society; founded with others the Crescent Moon Book Company; and published the Crescent Moon Monthly and, in short, turned everything he touched into Crescent Moon. Although he never proclaimed that the pai-hua regulated poetry movement should bear the name Crescent Moon, his obvious approval of the title of the book Hsin-yüeh shih-hsüan (新月詩選) (Anthology of

Crescent Moon Poems) (Shanghai, 1931), which was edited by his disciple Ch'en Meng-chia (陳夢家) and was supposed to represent the poetry of the particular movement, helped to establish the term. Indeed, since these poems were called Crescent Moon poems, the poets who wrote them and the school to which they adhered were naturally Hsin-yüeh p'ai. However, from another point of view, the suitability of the term is questionable. Apart from the insignificant relationship between the poets of this school and all the Crescent Moon organizations, the term was to some extent arbitrary since it would appear to bestow all credit on Hsü Chih-mo for the development of the pai-hua regulated poetry movement. As a matter of fact, Wen I-to, in the first stage of the movement at least, was a more important figure and leader than Hsü Chih-mo in theory, practice and even editorial work, for the Poetry Magazine of the Peking Morning Post in 1926.(186) As far as the pai-hua regulated poetry movement is concerned, it seems more appropriate to substitute the term ke-lü p'ai (格律派) (school of regulated poetry), or hsin ke-lü p'ai (新格律派) (school of new regulated poetry), or pai-hua ke-lü shih p'ai (白話格律詩派) (school of pai-hua regulated poetry) for Hsin-yüeh p'ai, so as to be fair to all and to make the whole thing less complicated and more precise.

But Hsin-yüeh p'ai as a blanket term has been quite firmly established. Hsü Chih-mo himself evidently did not object to the word p'ai; in fact he used it when referring to his own poems in 1923 (187) although he never used the term Hsin-yüeh p'ai presumably because it had been coined by leftists. Liang Shih-ch'iu, for all his loathing for the term, had to admit that neither he nor others could ever hope to expunge it from the

history of modern Chinese literature on account of its long prevalence.(188) As p'ai is not always bad, perhaps it would not be beneath the dignity of the Crescent Moon people and the Crescent Moon sympathizers to accept the term in its innocent sense. Truly, there does not seem to be any other term that can be conveniently and justifiably used to cover all the people ranging from the members of the Crescent Moon Society in 1923 and 1924 to the contributors of Poetry Magazine (Shanghai) in 1931 who can be considered as Hsü Chih-mo's friends. As his literary associates consisted of not only poets but novelists, essayists, playwrights, and critics, the suggested term ke-lü p'ai would not be compehensive enough and only that of Hsin-yüeh p'ai could serve the purpose. When the term Hsin-yüeh p'ai is thus used, its English translation would best be Crescent Moon School or Group or simply Crescentists as the case may be.(189) None of these words implies any formal organization of a society or any sinister connotation and yet any of them can distinguish the people concerned from others in the field of modern Chinese literature.

E. Tagore's visit to China.

As was noted before, Hsü Chih-mo was interested in cultural exchange between the east and the west. While he was still in England, he already extended invitations to G. L. Dickinson and Roger Fry urging them to go to China for visiting and lecturing.(190) Upon his return to his homeland, he consulted Liang Ch'i-ch'ao and Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei (蔡元培) and was soon writing to his English friends on behalf of the Chiang-hsüeh she (講學社) (Peking Lectures Association)(191) to confirm the invitations he made in England.(192) However, neither Dickinson nor Fry accepted the invitation.(193)

Although replies from England were disappointing, good news came from India. Tagore decided to visit China in the spring of 1924.(194)

During Hans Driesch's stay in China, Hsü did not play a prominent role, apart from accompanying, or rather following him with others to Shantung (山東) province for sight-seeing;(195) but as to Tagore's visit to China, Hsü from the beginning to the end was the most active man on the Chinese side.(196) He was one of the admirers who earnestly published the glad tidings prior to Tagore's coming.(197) He stressed that China should welcome the Indian sage with open arms because Tagore, he proclaimed to his countrymen:

> ... can give us unestimable consolation, can break free the obstructed fountain head of our minds, can show us the direction and standard of our strife, can correct the abnormal conduct of violence and lawlessness in modern times, can touch our sorrowful hearts ... can dissipate our bewilderment in the period of transition, can enlarge our sympathy and love, can guide us into the perfect dreamland.(198)

By what could Tagore accomplish all this? Hsü affirmed that the Indian poet could work miracles simply by "his elevated and harmonious personality". He steered clear of Tagore's literary works but dwelled on this point by which he meant Tagore's unflagging zeal and practical work in the promulgation of his gospel of (a) universal love and sympathy, (b) idealism, (c) international peace and co-operation, (d) anti-materialism, (e) promotion of education, (f) creative life and (g) individual freedom.(199) Such a gospel was primarily intended for the younger generation. But this was the very ideological dose the Marxists would choke on, and it is not hard to imagine how they reacted in China where in the twenties nationalism and anti-imperialism ran deep in many young people's blood. Indeed, the acceptance of Tagore's "personality" would mean the rejection of class struggle, anti-imperialist movement, preaching of communism, etc. which were then sacred to the revolutionaries in China. Moreover, Tagore antagonized them by other activities such as talking to British, American and Japanese merchants in China, extending friendship to traditionalist scholars like Ku Hung-ming (辜鴻銘) and Ch'en San-li (陳三立), paying homage to the tomb of Confucius, calling on and exchanging gifts with the deposed Manchu emperor P'u-i (溥儀), and having dealings with warlords Ch'i Hsieh-yüan (齊燮元) and Yen Hsi-shan (閻錫山).(200) He might have improved his image a little if he had had a talk, as proposed by Hsü Chih-mo, with Dr. Sun Yat-sen.(201) Somehow this never took place. What he had already done was known to all and was liable to be construed by the leftists as support for traditionalism, feudalism, imperialism and warlordism. No wonder they not only harboured their displeasure inwardly but gave vent to it repeatedly.(202)

Tagore's visit to China, though warmly acclaimed by a number of academics, was hardly a success when every thing was taken into consideration.(203) He was disheartened by the end of his stay and Hsü Chih-mo shared all his sorrow.(204) But the sorrow, ironically, was to a great extent caused originally by nobody but Hsü himself! The fact was that Hsü alone represented the Peking Lecture Association in correspondence with Tagore, whose words in his diary: "... they [the Chinese] expected from me words of wisdom."(205) must have been due to Hsü's letters of admiration and praise. Indeed, from the materials still existing, we learn that Hsü wrote to Tagore prior to the latter's setting sail for China, assuring the Indian sage of political security, material comfort and above all, the Chinese young people's "yearning" for him.(206) The last point, in particular, must have tremendously fired Tagore's imagination - his hope being always on the youth. But actually Hsü in all his good will, innocence and, alas, excessive enthusiasm gave an inaccurate picture of the mental state of the Chinese young people; his words represented only the minority and even the minority's ardour soon died down after Tagore's earnest preaching of the eastern civilization which in his understanding was chiefly the Indian civilization. Instead of talking on poetry Tagore spoke upon philosophy in China and thought himself imparting the right kind of wisdom the Chinese people craved for, without knowing he had become the victim of Hsü's misinformation. His gospel the patriotic Chinese youth looked at contemptuously as nothing but the philosophy of the wang-kuo nu (亡國奴) (a slave whose country has lost her sovereignty).(207) Nevertheless, amidst the uproar of disapproval from the leftists, Hsü Chih-mo was the only person to take a staunch stand in

defence of Tagore. On 12th May, 1924, he spoke to a large group of students before Tagore delivered his last formal lecture in Peking.(208) He emphasized Tagore's innocent motive in his visit, his affection for the Chinese and his homage paid to China. He condemned the mistrust, suspicion and revilement which some radicals had heaped on Tagore. He admonished the students and at the same time affirmed Tagore's greatness saying:

> Fellow students, believe my words. A voice as great as his perhaps we shall never hear in our life again. Take your present chance. Beware of any future regrets! His personality can only find parallels in history. His magnanimous and tender soul, I am confident, will forever be a miracle in human memory. His infinite imagination and wide sympathy remind us of Whitman. His gospel of love and his zeal to promote it reminds us of Tolstoy. His strong will power and artistic talents remind us of Michelangelo who created the statue of Moses. His humour and wisdom remind us of Socrates and Lao Tzu. The harmony and grace of his personality remind us of Goethe in his old age. His hands (whose touch conveys benevolence and pure love), his persistent work for humanity and his great and far-reaching voice sometimes even invoke from us the image of the Saviour; his radiance, his music and his sublimity make us think of the great gods of Olympia ... (209)

And so forth and so on.

Hsü Chih-mo's enthusiastic introduction and staunch defence of Tagore made himself an object of hatred to the communists and their sympathizers even before he took up his pen a year later to ridicule Russia and argue against communism.(210)

Hsü's utterances about Tagore were all in the superative degree. In a letter to him he called the Indian poet "one of the greatest spirits the world has ever seen",

"the ... Niagara", and "the nightingale".(211) He even treated him as if he were God the most high or Zeus among the Greek deities.(212) Now in addition to Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, Russell and Dickinson, he found in Tagore a Teacher "in the oriental sense". Moreover, he saw in Tagore a father-figure, and he indeed called himself the Indian poet's "child".(213)

During Tagore's stay in China, Hsü discharged his duty most faithfully and almost filially as Tagore's interpreter, guide and companion. He won his affection as nobody did, receiving the Indian name Susima from him and also an Indian cap which he wore almost all the time during Tagore's visit.(214) He considered himself Tagore's disciple and was regarded as such by Tagore and others.(215) The Indian sage was indeed very fond of him. They travelled together to Japan after the China visit ended. And then they still continued their journey together till July when they had to say good-bye to each other in Hong Kong.(216)

However, Hsü's attitude towards the Indian poet's poetry was rather dubious. He wrote before Tagore's arrival:

> Whether his [Tagore's] poetry can be considered as an independent contribution [to world literature], whether his thought represents the under-current of the revival of the Indian race, whether his philosophy (if there is any) has attained a unique state ... These questions we are unable to answer.(217)

Hsü must have learned how Kuo Mo-jo and Wen I-to criticized rather harshly Tagore's poetry in 1923, dismissing it as something vague, insipid, formless and even harmful.(218) Whether he was influenced by them is difficult to say, but that his words showed little enthusiasm for Tagore's poetry is obvious. Another oblique evidence of his

indifference to Tagore's poetry was the little he did in the translation of Tagore's works. He had in fact translated only two short poems apart from a few, but not all, speeches given by the Indian sage in China and Japan.(219) What particular appreciation Hsü had for Tagore as a man of letters seemed to be Tagore's renovating spirit shown in his use of the vernacular tongue of Bengali in poetry. Hsü called him "a revolutionary in literature".(220) Some influence of Tagore's spirituality may be seen in some of Hsü's poems in his first collection but he certainly did not (for he could not) express Tagore's religious thought. Tagore's fondness for figurative speech and for a poetized prose style as manifested in his speeches was shared by Hsü who may have learned a good deal from the Indian master, presumably unconsciously, during the time when they were together in China and Japan.

Hsü's excessive praise and flattery of Tagore did not abate after the latter's departure. In a letter to his Indian master in 1925 he gave him the impression that his visit had left an indelible influence on the Chinese, and that a second visit was solicited.(221) It would seem that such a communication could only be interpreted as Hsü's personal folly. But one thing is worth noticing. Hsü in his letter mentioned Tuan Ch'i-jui (段祺瑞), the head of the Peking government, who wished Tagore to visit China again in the "near future".(222) We can hardly imagine Tuan Ch'i-jui to have become particularly interested in poetry or cultural matters in 1925. Probably he just wanted to augment his political credit by Tagore's presence. To such an official invitation Tagore did not respond. If he had, both he and Hsü would have been criticized even more severely by the left-wing people. Except for Hsü Chih-mo, Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, Lin

Ch'ang-min, Tuan Ch'i-jui et al , few would have cared to hail Tagore for a second time.(223)

In the realm of religion, Hsü was aware even before seeing Tagore in person that the Indian poet's was not any organized religion that could be easily defined. Tagore's religious, or philosophical thought, Hsü said, was "only the poet's ... occasional flow of his poetic mind" and it had "the quality of entirety, independence and purity that defies analysis".(224) He commented on Tagore's religion in terms of poetry. However, a new vista was opened up to him after Tagore had come. He witnessed Tagore's deep devotion to God, and as his interpreter and companion, he must have heard Tagore in reply to some students' questions avowing that he could not answer questions about "what happens after death", but he had been "saved from doubts and fears" because his soul had had the experience of touching "the infinite and has become intensely conscious of it through the illumination of joy".(225) Hsü could not have failed to comprehend that Tagore's God was more concrete than he had thought. It was more than poetry. Indeed, there was something romantic and fascinating about Tagore's informal worship in nature that knew no material temples or churches, traditional rites or ceremonies.(226) Hsü never entered fully into Tagore's religious experience, but his writings showed an enquiring attitude and even religious feelings after his contact with Tagore. After all, Hsü's sojourn on this planet was too brief for him "to discover some everlasting value in this mutable life".(227) He died without finding Tagore's God.

Another new and charming vista opened up to Hsü with regard to Tagore's visit to China was the latter's rural reconstruction work in India. Hsü did not seem to know much about it before he met Tagore the reformer.

However, Tagore confided to him his plan, and on 20th May, Tagore, carrying Dr. Gilbert Reid's letter of introduction,(228) took Hsü Chih-mo to Taiyuan (太原), Shansi (山西) province with his colleagues from India by a night train for a meeting with Yen Hsi-shan, the military governor. Tagore made the special trip for a specific purpose. In his talk with Yen he offered to help run a rural reconstruction project like the one he established in India. The suggestion pleased Yen who had learned about and admired Tagore's work the year before when L. K. Elmhirst was visiting the province.(229) According to Elmhirst, Tagore

> ... received from him [Yen] the offer of the ancient Taoist temple of Jin Tse and enough land for the starting of a centre in China where Indian, Chinese and others might carry out research in rural economic and social problems as at the poet's own institution of Rural Reconstruction at Sriniketan.(230)

As to Hsü Chih-mo, Elmhirst described him as "full of his own delight over the prospect ..."(231)

With all his visions Hsü also went to see the Director of Education of the province and secured a promise of co-operation from him.(232) Then it was agreed upon between the Governor and Tagore that Elmhirst and some others would come to Shansi from India to launch the project the next spring.(233)

The mission of Tagore in Shansi appeared to be a half-secret because it was only known by the people concerned. The Chinese supporters, besides Hsü Chih-mo, were P. C. Chang and C. Y. Chu.(234)

Hsü's enthusiasm for the project, as observed by Elmhirst, was a poet's, or a child's genuine ardour.

Actually he did not have the foggiest idea about the practical work in rural reconstruction. As to the choice of locality, which was made by P. C. Chang and others[235] who valued the security and stability of Shansi province under Yen Hsi-shan, it would not have been entirely satisfactory to Hsü since he abhorred Yen's essentially traditional approach to education.[236] But this would not have bothered him much. He must have painted for himself an idyllic picture in his mind and visualized the time in the distant future when the people in Jin Tse, especially the young ones, would be not only peasants engaged in their farm work but dancers, singers, actors, artists and even poets taking part in various kinds of cultural activities after laying down their farm tools in the late afternoon, in the evening or during the holidays. It would be a life in which the return to nature and expansion of culture would be combined. Unfortunately, this charming ideal never came into being. According to Elmhirst, the subsequent domestic political upheaval in China killed the project which, however, remained part of Hsü's dream of utopia until 1928 when it vanished like morning dew after a new ray of hope was discerned.[237]

The affinity between Hsü and Tagore was understandable. Stephen N. Hay suggested that it was due to their "similar family backgrounds; their contacts with cultured westerners, and their development as creative artists."[238] L. K. Elmhirst hinted at "their love of literature as well as of ideas, of poetry, of phantasy, and of fun ..."[239] Some Chinese friends of Hsü were of the opinion that their disposition for mysticism cemented their friendship.[240] But a more significant aspect is that both of them felt a responsibility to their own countries.[241] They were eager to see both China and

India fettered by no domestic or foreign powers and their peoples enjoy a life with both material and cultural blessings.

Further, a last point that may be added is Hsü's hero-worship.(242) Of all the distinguished men with whom he entered into contact, none in 1924 attained a greater international stature than Tagore, a Nobel prize winner. Any hero-worshipper would adore such a hero especially when the hero was amiable enough to condescend to bestow friendship.

Tagore's influence on Hsü's outlook on the political and social side of life is conspicuous. Although Tagore's opposition to nationalism, colonialism, imperialism, violence and any kind of regimentation and standardization in thought, and his gospel of universal love, sympathy, co-operation, nature worship, etc. were not new to Hsü, they as a confirmation of what Hsü already had cherished as truth since his England days must have been a great encouragement and stimulation to him who now could speak and write about them with greater clarity and deeper conviction.

But in terms of cultural exchange between China and India as conceived by Tagore,(243) Hsü was by no means a prominent figure. He made no response to the Indian poet's appeal for a revitalization of eastern culture and he apparently nourished a Daniel's reluctance to touch the rich food of Bengali literature. The only person who relished the idea of venturing into the world of Indian culture and did erect a landmark in Sino-Indian cultural exchange was T'an Yün-shan (譚雲山) who, "inspired by Gurudeva [Tagore]'s ideal and message", spent a number of years in Visva-Bharati University teaching and at the same time learning.(244) However, before Tagore met T'an in 1927,

Hsü Chih-mo was definitely the person in whom Tagore found genuine friendship, comradeship and comfort.(245) Even if Tagore had failed in every attempt in China in 1924, he still had a significant success, the success of obtaining a good friend and devoted disciple. As for Hsü, he won two hearts, those of Tagore and his friend and secretary L. K. Elmhirst.(246)

F. Poetical works.[247]

Hsü Chih-mo in the ten years of his literary career (1921-1931) wrote approximately a hundred and sixty poems excluding about two dozen translations and a large number of juvenile verses; most of the latter kind have been lost or destroyed. The present paper, on account of its limited scope as a thesis, does not permit a detailed study of his poetry and therefore the following pages related to this topic in this and the other chapters can only deal with some salient features that may be of interest to tne literary historian.

In this chapter our discussion is centred on Hsü's poems written in or before 1924; the bulk of them were published in book form first in 1925 under the title of Chih-mo ti shih (志摩的詩) (Chih-mo's Poems).[248] The poet himself obviously thought highly of this volume at first, and dedicated it to his father.[249] It probably was the only collection of pai-hua verse that was string-bound in the traditional fashion, and was printed on the expensive rice paper and lien-shih (連史) paper respectively in two editions issued for sale in Peking at the same time. Their prices, compared with other books', were very high.[250] But they were soon sold out; and by 1933 Chih-mo's Poems had already enjoyed six impressions.[251] Its popularity was beyond doubt.

For the sake of convenience, the poems to be discussed are grouped under three headings, namely, love poems, social poems and reflective poems.[252]

1. Love poems.

Before entering into any details, it is appropriate to establish the fact that Hsü's poetry is in the main the reflection of his own life which in the early twenties is chiefly his love life. He made it clear in his essay "Random Notes" that the paramount importance in verse-making is the poet's expression of his personality.(253) He stuck to this romantic idea in his creative work. But oddly enough, some critics hold opposite views, maintaining that Hsü's verse is not exactly associated with his life or personality. To this Mu Mu-t'ien (穆木天) has provided a judicious reply:

> His [Hsü's literary] works reflect his personality through and through, and are always his true and subjective products.(254)

We have seen in the previous chapter the first stage of Hsü's poetic career in Cambridge. The power that drove him to poetry continued to work in him after he returned to China. Whether it was a sweet or bitter cup of life he had to taste, Love laid on him a heavy burden that could only be unloaded by the help of verse. Of course he was interested in political and social problems and was not devoid of religious sentiments, but none of them proved to be an irresistible driving power like love. He confessed thus:

> Love is the centre and essence of life.
> Success in love is success in life and
> failure in love is failure in life.
> This is unquestionable.(255)

Among his love poems, those written before 1924 can be legitimately regarded as being associated with Lin Hui-yin. For instance, "Pei-fang ti tung-t'ien shih tung-t'ien" (北方的冬天是冬天) (The Winter in the North Is Winter),[256] written shortly after his return to China, depicts a bleak picture of the Peking winter but on the other hand it proclaims a message of persevering struggle and predicts the final victory of the warrior. Later comes "Hsi-wang ti mai-tsang" (希望的埋葬) (The Burial of A Hope)[257] which is followed by "Ch'ing szu" (情死) (Love-Death). The title of the second is sufficient to convey the content of the poem and "Love-Death" is more or less a poetized imitation of the final scene of Gabriele d'Annunzio's The Dead City where the hero destroys himself and his mistress in a violent action - the idea being realizing love in death.[258] All this can well be viewed as the mental state of Hsü who envisaged the obstacles in his love life, attempted at first optimistically to fight for his goal and eventually had to succumb to failure.

The four poems: "Wei shei" (為誰) (For Whom), "Wen shei" (問誰) (Ask Whom), "Ch'ü pa" (去罷) (Away) and "I hsing jo ho" (一星弱火) (A Gleam of Light), imply an identical theme, that is, love is dead. In this connection their association with Lin Hui-yin is quite possible. "Away" is particularly revealing in this respect. It was written some time before Hsü left China for Japan with Tagore in May, 1924 when it was crystal clear that Lin Hui-yin was not to be won. Lin Ch'ang-min, referring to that poem, was reported to have felt concerned about the poet, and Chiang Fu-ts'ung (蔣復璁) even feared that Hsü might have contemplated suicide.[259] Actually "Away" was not a poem that should have caused anxiety. Mu Mu-t'ien was right in affirming that it in the main communicated the sentiments of Nietzsche's Zarathustra, or Superman.[260]

Indeed, we can almost visualize how the poet kept a stiff upper lip when completing the verse and was bracing himself up for fresh battles in life. The poem conveys no less Hsü's philosophy of life than his failure in love. A man who could produce such lines was not a Werther who would solve his problems by self-destruction unless he drastically revised his Weltanschauung.

Unfortunately there is no way to tell the exact year for most of his love poems.(261) All we can say is that those undated ones are related to the poet's affairs with either Lin Hui-yin or Lu Hsiao-man. Speculation would be unprofitable since in both cases Hsü underwent somewhat the same agony.

There are a few things in Hsü's love poems that attract attention. First, a highly personal note. The poet's "I" appears in nearly all poems of this category and the female character, being present frequently though less often than the poet himself, is "she" or sometimes "you" (singular sense). Secondly, the moaning, sorrow and agony of the loser and sufferer. Thirdly, the striving spirit of Nietzsche as mentioned above. These features are conspicuous either collectively or individually in such lyrics as "Lo-yeh hsiao ch'ang" (落葉小唱) (A Melody of Fallen Leaves), "Ask Whom", "Che shih i-ko no-jo ti shih-chieh" (這是一個懦弱的世界) (This Is A Cowardly World), "Away", "A Gleam of Light", "Pu tsai shih wo ti kuai-kuai" (不再是我的乖乖) (No Longer My Darling), "To-hsieh t'ien wo ti hsin yu i tu ti t'iao-tang" (多謝天我的心又一度的跳盪) (Thank Heaven, My Heart Leaps Up Once Again), "Wu t'i" (無題) (Without A Title) and "Tsai na shan-tao p'ang" (在那山道旁) (By A Mountain Pass). Fourthly, from "For Whom", "Ask Whom", "Away", "A Gleam of Light" and poems of a similar type, we

can see that when the poet writes on his sorrow, he tends to add more music to the language and more regularity to the sturucture of his verse. All these particulars, with the exception of the last one, are quite understandable when we bear in mind the poet's life and his thought.

2. Social poems.

In his social poems, Hsü Chih-mo often employed Thomas Hardy's method in portraying poor people and their life by "humbly recording diverse readings of its [life's] phenomena as they are forced upon us by chance and change".(262) But this relatively objective "exploration of reality",(263) occasionally carrying with it a tinge of irony, was unfamiliar to and by no means appreciated by the Chinese reader and that is why a typical poem of this category, i.e., "I hsiao fu ch'iung lo t'u" (一小幅窮樂圖) (A Sketch of Joy in Poverty) was severely condemned by the critics.(264) From their reading between the lines, they affirmed that the poet delighted to see the poor people trying to salvage something useful or eatable from a pile of rubbish, and accused him of callousness. Undoubtedly, what they wished to see in such a poem was some "blood and tears" or, in Hsü's words, "yelling and crying", but unfortunately, all this was abhorrent to the poet; for Hsü spurned it as mere sentimentality and even insincerity.(265)

"Chiao-hua huo-kai" (叫化活該) (You Deserve It, Beggar) and "Shei chih-tao" (誰知道) (Who Knows) are often regarded as social poems on account of the

presence of the beggar and the ricksha puller in their respective contexts. Actually the real "beggar" is the poet himself; the last stanza clearly indicates this fact. It is therefore quite plain that "You Deserve It, Beggar" has a strong personal vein, expressing the poet's own distress at being excluded. It may well be called a love poem as related to the poet's life in 1923.(266)

Chu Hsiang (朱湘) (1904-1933) disparaged "Who Knows" and other similar pieces, contemptuously dubbing them "ricksha verses in Dr. Hu Shih's manner".(267) Chu's objection was directed to the prosaic style and the social implication of humanitarianism supposed to be attached to them. But a careful reading of "Who Knows", however, would at once convince the reader that it is not an account of the poet's actual experience of riding in a ricksha at night; for it is just impossible that the ricksha puller, earning his living in the city streets, could lose his way in a place where "... there were graves everywhere" and "... not a light was seen ...". The poem in question is in fact symbolic, and appears to represent the idea that life moves along a tortuous, bumpy way amidst terror and death in darkness; hopes, if any, are dim. Viewed in this prespective, the ricksha puller may be interpreted as destiny, leading man to the "waste land", or death, or simply nowhere. This poem may more suitably be called a reflective one. It is rather philosophical indeed.

When "I-t'iao chin-se ti kuang-hen" (一條金色的光痕) (A Ray of Golden Light) was first published in Peking Morning Post on 15th July, 1925, the poet informed his readers of the factual basis of the poem: a poor old woman died of hunger and cold and another kind-hearted poor old woman was raising money to bury her. When she came to ask for help from the poet's mother, the latter gave her

both money and some clothes. It was a poem expounding an entry in his aphoristic English diary "Florentine Journal": "The most powerful and most pregnant sentiment next to Love is that of Pity".(268) The poem was originally preceded by a fairly long prologue; part of it reads:

> Pessimism is in fashion. Scepticism is the intellectuals' passport ... But I still refuse to believe that the sad clouds and dreary fog will linger on forever, and that the warm sun has disappeared forever from the human world. Indeed, perhaps when it is still raining cats and dogs ... from a rift of the clouds in the western or eastern sky, a ray of golden light will reveal itself! The fact recorded in the following verse in some people's eyes is perhaps a ray of golden light. Although appearing as a lump of bloody and selfish lusts, human beings are not devoid of some noble elements.

The prologue is a declaration of the poet's belief in the future of mankind and in the virtue of sympathy. As to his subsequent withdrawal of it, which was done apparently in line with the removal of the prologue preceding his translated poem of Baudelaire's "Une Charogne", it might have been owing to the obvious praise of his own mother's nobility of nature therein.

"T'ai-p'ing ching-hsiang" (太平景象) (A Scene of Peace) is a poem full of Hardyan flavour. The ironical title,(269) the casual dialogue, the seemingly dispassionate and vivid recording of a railway station scene are unmistakable. The poet probably witnessed the incident after he had bidden Tagore farewell in 1924 and was back in Chekiang or Kiangsu province from Hong Kong.(270) At that time the warlords Lu Yung-hsiang (盧永祥) and Ch'i Hsieh-yüan were opposed to each other and troops were being manoeuvred

in the two provinces named above. War eventually broke out in September. The poem, first published in August, exposed the senselessness and cruelty of the civil war, the poverty of the common people, their resignation to fate and the feelings of the soldiers.

In so far as Hsü's social poems in the first collection are concerned, three prose poems, i.e., "Poison", "White Flag" and "Baby" merit our attention. They were originally one poem with three parts.(271) Although later Hsü separated them into three individual poems, they are better to be treated as an organic whole. In "Poison", Hsü put himself in the position as Nietzsche did in Thus Spake Zarathustra.(272) He pointed out all the evils of the world, or rather China, and demanded his audience to believe his words which embodied truth! From there he proceeded to "White Flag", the gospel in which was supposed to be a way, or the way, to remedy all the sins exposed in "Poison". Hsü assumed the role of an evangelist or a prophet,(273) if not Christ himself, proclaiming something like "...the kingdom of God is at hand; repent, and believe in the gospel". According to him, when the universal repentance was complete, the "great reality", which was the message in "Baby", would be born. Hsü's own interpretation of this "great reality", or the "Baby", was "a glorious future",(274) and Mao Tun understood it as the Anglo-American type of democracy(275) which was indeed the poet's political dream occurring to him first in his student days in the west. There is certainly some Christian colour in these three poems which, however, may also be treated as a modern poetic expression of the Confucian idea of "rectification of heart";(276) or as an echo to the conviction of the necessity for "a change in the human heart" cherished by Dickinson.(277) Moreover, it is the "ideological revolution"

upheld by the Peking Morning Post, or the "mental revolution" used by Hsü in 1929 with regard to Liang Ch'i-ch'ao.(278) As mentioned previously, a strong resemblance can be seen between these poems and Carpenter's Towards Democracy.(279)

Hsü Chih-mo profoundly deplored the Chinese civil war in the latter part of 1924 which, shaking the country with its operations, created a situation that was a sharp contrast to the relatively peaceful time when he enjoyed travelling in happiness with Tagore both in China and Japan only a few months before. The three prose poems were the products during the civil war period.(280) The feeling attached to themwas so strong that he mentioned them in two speeches first in 1924 and later in 1929.(281)

It is worth noting that with all his abhorrence for the civil war, he did not mark out the warlords for reprimand as many other people did. In his judgement, the villains responsible for all the chaos in China were not only a handful of military men or politicians or capitalists but also all the people from the president down to the dust-man, hence his message in the three poems.(282)

Most leftist critics, while generally condemning Hsü Chih-mo's non-Marxist ideas, reserve some favour for his first collection mainly because of the presence of the social poems.(283) The Chinese communists, however, refuse to acknowledge any "progressiveness" in such verses simply because of some old feuds.(284) The Russians, being less rigid in recent years after opening a "revisionist" era, have included quite a number of Hsü's poems, particularly from the first collection, in an anthology of lyrics on the ground that such poems have some "humanistic character".(285) It seems that as far as their criteria are concerned, "Poison" and "White Flag" must have appealed to them more stirringly than others. They must have seen lyricism in them in addition to social significance.

3. Reflective poems.[286]

Chu Hsiang informed his readers in 1926 that Hsü Chih-mo considered about one third of Chih-mo's Poems to be "philosophical" and Hsü rated such pieces the highest.[287] Chu Hsiang, who maintained that poetry should express nothing but emotion, taught Hsü a lesson in his critique. But did Hsü Chih-mo really have any philosophical message to preach? The answer seems to be negative. Most of those poems censured by Chu are on the whole descriptive and narrative in essence; and the taint of "philosophy", which is frequently made felt in the last part of a poem, mostly concerns the poet's meditation on life and death or on such abstract subjects as love, beauty, truth, friendship, ideals, etc. He makes enquiries, but is unable to obtain or offer satisfactory answers.

Chu Hsiang also alleged that the "philosophical" elements in Hsü were due to the influence of Tagore and Hu Shih.[288] Liang Shih-ch'iu was far less peremptory, only hinting that a few poems in the first collection "might have been owing to the influence of Tagore".[289] Comparing Chih-mo's Poems with Tagore's poetical works, one will conclude that Hsü's verses do not carry the spiritual conviction which permeates the Indian poet's works, many of which are in fact meditations comparable to the Psalms in the Old Testament. In Hsü, the most religious piece is "Ch'ang-chou T'ien-ning szu wen li-ch'an sheng" (常州天寧寺聞禮懺聲) (Hearing the Chanting at T'ien-ning Monastery in Ch'ang-chou) in which a state of ching-ting (靜定) (tranquility and repose) that Hsü values most is beautifully demonstrated.[290] Elsewhere he even equated such a state with tao (道) (way; way of life; universal truth, etc.);[291] but his "world" is not quite Tagore's "world".[292] None

the less, all this is not meant to negate Tagore's influence; the image of a child buidling sand houses on the beach, the pantheistic mood, the streak of religion, etc.[293] as seen in the poems may reasonably have been the result of Hsü's contact with the Indian poet though evidently Hsü already manifested some interest in the spiritual realm even before Tagore's visit to China.[294]

It would seem that Hsü's developing an interest in philosophy, or religion, dated back to his Cambridge days when nature worship and mysticism began to grow in him. Later the six deaths (i.e., those of Katherine Mansfield; Hsü's grandmother; Ch'en Shih-tseng (陳師曾); his cousin and classmate Shen Shu-wei (沈叔薇); a sister-in-law; and an aunt),[295] occurring in a period of only two years, would have most probably affected him and led him nearer to the realm of religion.[296]

Hsü's reflective poems convince us that the poet was not always a "wild horse" as he was supposed to be. He was capable of contemplation and was earnestly "engaged in a search in heaven and on earth"[297] trying to solve the riddles of life and its relevant phenomena.

4. Forms.

Hsü Chih-mo started experimenting with poetic forms shortly after he returned to China from Europe.[298] Although it is possible that his interest was aroused by the reading of Hardy, there was every reason for him to take up the work even if he knew nothing about Hardy since modern Chinese poetry in the early twenties was indeed in an experimental stage. The time was just right for him, a man

curious about new things. Undoubtedly he drew his inspiration from English poetry; but, as Prof. Cyril Birch has pointed out, many forms he used did not owe their birth to English poetry.(299) Hsü just created whatever forms he liked. However, it would not be too rash to conclude that from the beginning of his experiments he had already shown a preference for the most common stanza form in English verse - the quatrain.

Hsü Chih-mo was by no means the first person to experiment with new forms in modern Chinese poetry,(300) but he was the first man who persevered in the work from the beginning to the end of his career as a poet, and admittedly achieved the most. It is interesting to note, however, that he seemed to avoid the form of hsiao-shih(小詩) (short verse) which was in vogue in China in the very early twenties. The explanation perhaps lies in the fact that to a man who had an abundance of emotion to discharge and some passionate messages to publish, the form that consists of two to three short lines would hardly have any appeal. On the other hand, his more influential contemporaries like Kuo Mo-jo and Wen I-to were definitely opposed to the short verse movement(301)(if it could be called a movement at all),and the upholders of the short verse, notably Chou Tso-jen and Ping Hsin (冰心), were weak in their defence - Chou was essentially not a poet and Ping Hsin was more or less silenced by Liang Shih-ch'iu in 1923.(302)

As noted before, among the Chinese poets of his generation, Hsü first admired Kuo Mo-jo; and like Kuo, Hsü rather disdained poetic technique as such before he became a regular guest in Wen I-to's fanciful studio in 1926.(303) His indifference was seen in an essay of his written in 1923:

> Recently some people have desired to use scientific methods to study poetry, that is to say studying and comparing metres, rhythm, words and sentences, hoping to arrive at some rules for making good poetry ... but we dare not admire the omnipotence of science.(304)

Then he affirmed: "What the poet seeks is only inspiration... As soon as it arrives, there is the magic; the outcome is poetry and beauty."(305) In 1931 when he wrote in retrospect with regard to his first collection of poems, he said: "Chih-mo's Poems ... is mostly an uncontrolled inundation of emotion, without any reference to poetic art or technique."(306) What Hsü experimented with, in or before 1926, chiefly concerned stanza forms, and any other signs of technical experiments, with the exception of his poetic language, were not conscious efforts done in the spirit of experimentation.(307)

In this discussion of forms, a few words must be said about Hsü's prose poems and free verse. Strictly speaking, there are only four prose poems in Chih-mo's Poems, i.e., "Poison", "White Flag", "Baby" and "Hearing the Chanting at T'ien-ning Monastery in Ch'ang-chou". These compositions are either rhetorical or lyrical, or a combination of both, and are crowded with figures of speech. Chu Hsiang prasied the poet's observation, imagination and ability for selection of material and also commented on their shortcomings and limitations.(308)

One might expect to see some link between Baudelaire and Hsü in terms of prose poems since the latter wrote an essay entitled "Po-t'e-lai ti san-wen shih" (波特萊的散文詩) (Baudelaire's Prose Poems).(309) However, he did not keep closely to the subject, and the insertion of both English and French words and quotations could not but arouse suspicion that the essay in question might not have

been an entirely original piece of writing but a mixture of translation and adaptation, just as was the case in one or two passages in his essays on d'Annunzio.(310) None the less, he must have known something about Baudelaire's prose poems and also Tagore's. In Hsü's, however, what he aimed at was the "poems" rather than the "prose". As far as the latter word is concerned, Hsü only used its form; in other words, he employed the paragraph unit in a prose poem just as he used a long line in an ordinary one. Probably his acceptance of the form of prose poem and the rejection of the "short verse" sprang from the same origin. The former provided him with a wide scope for his exuberant emotion which was embodied in extended imagery (as in "Chanting in T'ien-ning") or in earnest and passionate "sermons" (as in "Poison", "White Flag" and "Baby"). Indeed, a paragraph in a prose poem was a big poetic line which, as it were, was a big trumpet from which the poet could blow his lyricism or rhetoric abroad.

As to free verse, perhaps we can roughly bundle together a number of Hsü's early pieces, both in or outside Chih-mo's Poems, and call them such, but the result would be very disconcerting. For example, "Hui-se ti jen-sheng" (灰色的人生) (The Life of Grey Colour), "The Winter in the North Is Winter", " Nature and Life", etc. with their sporadic rhyming might not fully qualify as free verse. On the other hand, "K'a-erh-fo-li" (卡爾佛里) (Calvary) and "K'ang-ch'iao tsai-hui pa" (康橋再會罷) (Farewell to Cambridge), with their poetic lines of fairly even length, resemble English blank verse, though it would be fanciful to treat them as written in iambic pentameter. The remaining poems that can be honoured as genuine free verse are therefore only a few - "A Ray of

Golden Light", "Love-Death" and "Kuei-kuo tsa-t'i" (歸國雜題) (Miscellaneous Pieces Written on My Way Home).

Undoubtedly Hsü's poetically "free" period was the very early time of his poetical career when he was, as a novice, subject to the dictates of fashion in pai-hua poetry. Indeed, his first hero was Kuo Mo-jo who wrote "freely". It would seem that the presence and absence of some sporadic rhyming are evidence of the freedom he enjoyed in free verse, and that he did not really bother about uniformity in rhyming or not rhyming, or consistency in perfect and imperfect rhymes.

5. Language.

Before we discuss the language in Hsü's poetry, we must bear in mind that the poet was well-versed in wen-yen and his earliest literary products were not in pai-hua. After returning to China in 1922, he still could not quite disentangle himself from the classical tradition and in "Farewell to Cambridge" he used many wen-yen phrases, mainly four-character clichés like "hsin suan lo lei" (心酸落淚) (being grieved and shedding tears), "Hsing hsing hsi pieh" (惺惺惜別) (very reluctant to say good-bye), etc.(311) Then he seemed to have made an effort to purify his diction, first of all shaking off the undesirable wen-yen elements. The second endeavour, constructive and courageous, evolved along two lines: (a) salvaging usable wen-yen expressions, especially those two-character nouns or verbs, e.g., "liao-jao" (繚繞) (surround; wind around), "p'i-ni" (睥睨) (look askance), "fang-li" (芳醴) (nectarous

wine), etc.[312]; (b) assimilating English expressions. Two highly typical examples of which are "wo-ti shih wu-pien ti hei-yeh" (我的是無邊的黑夜) (Mine is the infinite dark night)[313] and the last stanza of "Yüeh hsia Lei Feng ying p'ien" (月下雷峯影片) (Lei Feng Pagoda in Moonlight):

深深的黑夜，依依的塔影，
團團的月彩，纖纖的波鱗——
假如你我蕩一支無遮的小艇，
假如你我創一個完全的夢境！

(A deep, deep, night; a dear, dear shadow of
the Pagoda.
The round, round moon; the fine, fine
ripples -
Would that we were rowing in an open boat;
Would that we could create a perfect dream!)

The first instance is sufficiently un-Chinese while the last two lines of the second one, understandable in English translation, sound incomplete in the Chinese original. A native of China who has no western languages may ask after finishing the poem, "Then what?"

It is not difficult for the reader to see in Hsü a blended poetic language that has its own peculiarity - a kind of "cultural exchange" among pai-hua, wen-yen and English, or as Průšek calls it, an "intellectualized diction".[314] The wen-yen morceaux inevitably enhance the ornateness of many of his lyrics and this characteristic is commended by some and condemned by others.[315] The critics of the latter group are mostly socialists who see the elegance of Hsü's language as a form of aristocracy in literature that does not benefit the masses of working people. As to the foreign elements, generally there is more censure than approval from critics irrespective of

their political leanings. The almost unanimous verdict of sheng-ying (生硬) (crudeness and stiffness) is usually passed on his westernized syntax which, fortunately, is by no means a prominent feature in his verse.(316) But does unanimity betoken the indisputable truth in Hsü's case? It is not very easy to answer this question. However, insofar as the Chinese language is concerned, if the Buddhist influence on it in the olden days is not to be resented or rejected, there is no reason why western elements should not be absorbed in the modern times. And further, if we agree with T. S. Eliot that the "direct duty" of a poet is not only to "preserve" but to "extend and improve" his language, Hsü's case may be considered as a matter of extension of the Chinese poetic language.(317) To illustrate with the last stanza of "Lei Feng Pagoda in Moonlight" again: if one more line were added to reply to the question "Then what?", a great deal of poetic flavour would vanish; not even a beautiful line like Omar Khayyám's "And Wilderness is Paradise enow."(318) could adequately retain it, let alone a prosaic and yet legitimate line like "Na chiu hao liao!" (那就好了) (That would be wonderful). From this point of view, the defect of Hsü's language does not lie in his Europeanization but in hackneyed expressions such as "Pai-yün tsai lan-t'ien li fei-hsing" (白雲在藍天裏飛行) (White clouds are flying in the blue sky); "ping-leng ti tung-yeh" (冰冷的冬夜) (An icy-cold winter night); "ch'iu-yüeh ti ming-hui" (秋月的明輝) (The pure light of the Autumn moon), etc.(319)

Significantly enough, Hsü's experiment with poetic language is also indicative of his intellectual pursuits in life. The adherence to some wen-yen expressions denotes his yearning for beauty, and the Europeanization of sentence betokens his admiration for western, or more accurately,

English culture.

But all the foregoing is only one side of the "coin" and, unfortunately, the only side that often attracts attention from both friends and foes. The other side, i.e., colloquialism, does not often arouse active interest.

It is of course arguable that colloquialism in Hsü should be discussed under "colloquial poems" in the section on "Forms".(320) However, it seems more justifiable and is decidedly more convenient to deal with it here as a feature of his poetic language in view of its frequent occurrence in almost all kinds of his works.

On the whole, the colloquialism in Hsü is most closely tied in with his social poems, and is usually linked with humanitarianism which, being a popular trend in pai-hua poetry since its very birth in 1917, is strong in Hsü and his contemporary men of letters. In analysis, this humanitarianism has its roots in the writer's ego. Although the Chinese writers in the twenties were mostly of the middle class and were considerably better off than the working men and the peasants, they had their grievances, hardships and both physical and mental sufferings owing to the chaotic domestic situation and to the encroachment, exploitation and even personal insults of foreigners. When they wrote to express the hsin-sheng (心聲) (feelings; literally, heart's voice) of the masses or introduced to their countrymen literary works by writers of oppressed nations,(321) they in fact poured out their own heart in an oblique way. Indeed, the Shelleyan self-pity is visible in Hsü and many of his contemporaries. In this consideration, Hsü's colloquialism has some phychological overtones. "You Deserve It, Beggar" is a good example.(322)

Hsü evidently did not employ colloquialism to the end of universality of poetry for the benefit of the working men or peasants. If he had aimed at tao min-chien ch'ü (到民間去) (going to the people),[323] he should have used colloquialism for the production of slogan verse. His conscious use of this device was for poetic experimentation just as was the case with stanza forms; and therefore his experiment was not confined to the colloquialism of pai-hua, or kuo-yü (國語) (the national language). As Chih-mo's Poems shows, he also tried his hand at his native dialect and wrote "A Ray of Golden Light", a typical dialectal poem.

It is noticeable that Hsü's colloquial poems are mostly rhymed, reminiscent of the traditional hsin yüeh-fu (新樂府) (new ballads); and indeed Hu Shih once implied that "A Ray of Golden Light" was representative of the modern version of the new ballads written by the T'ang poet Po Chü-i (白居易).[324] In comparison, Hsü's works are generally less regular than those by Wen I-to whose ke-lü (格律) (regularity; form) can be as distinctive in colloquial poems as in literary lyrics. In this respect, Hsü's colloquialism is more colloquial than Wen's; but it may not be as natural as that in some of Lao She (老舍)'s stories since verse can never enjoy the almost limitless freedom as prose, and on the other hand, Lao She is a native of Peking while Hsü is not.

Chih-mo's Poems reveals the poet's affection for duplication of words which is a poetic device dating back to the most ancient Chinese anthology of verse - Shih-ching (詩經) (Book of Songs). Hsü achieved the desired effect of music, harmony and stress when he employed this technique in some of his poems and the manifestation of his mastery is seen in "Hu Hang ch'e chung" (滬杭車中) (On Board the

Shanghai-Hangchow Train).[325] Perhaps this poem is the only one in modern pai-hua verse that can compete with Li Ch'ing-chao (李清照)'s famous "Sheng sheng man" (聲聲慢) in which the Sung poetess had made the particular device of verbal duplication immortal in Chinese poetry. Hsü's duplication is variegated; it includes that of phrases and even of sentences.[326] It is because of this that his duplication, unlike Yü P'ing-po (俞平伯)'s, does not bore the reader.[327]

However, Hsü's tui-tieh (堆疊) (repetition of synonyms) in poems like "Nature and Life", which is apparently an imitation of Byron's description of a storm scene in Childe Harold's Pilgrimage (Canto 3, XCII-XCVII), is almost unbearable. The grandeur and beauty Byron achieved in that part did not depend on repetition, but Hsü in his effort to perform the same task used a tool to the degree of abusage, hence the failure.

6. Imagery.

A detailed examination of imagery in Hsü Chih-mo's works may justify the writing of a monograph. In this paper we shall confine ourselves to a few conspicuous aspects of it with special relation to his life.

Hsü often uses the night as a setting which, as such, reigns supreme in all his works. In contrast to this, the day, when appearing, seldom gives the impression of a sunny day. It is mostly tinged with a sombre hue and the overall colour is practically that of the night or at least that of the twilight. The only verse by Hsü that has the night as setting and also as the central theme is

"Night", a fairly long prose poem written in Cambridge.(328) It is important in terms of imagery since it gives us a deeper insight into the all-pervading imagery of night in the poet's works. The poem starts with "Night, you all-inclusive night, I praise thee!" The whole poem, or rather the night, is full of mysticism. In the poet's understanding, it gives birth to the civilization of mankind; it discloses many jealously guarded secrets of the universe; it leads man to truth, wisdom, revelation and God Himself. Such a treatment of the night reminds us of the function of the Holy Ghost as revealed in the New Testament. This becomes even more relevant when we look back upon Hsü's early university education at the Shanghai Baptist College and Theological Seminary.

Tagore loves night, making in one of his poems the apostrophe: "Make me thy poet, O Night, veiled Night." (329) Although Tagore is apparently aiming at symbolism here as the context of his poem suggests and Hsü is not directly influenced by him in this respect, the night does attract both of them in a similar manner, and the following words of the Indian poet can well be taken as comments on the relationship between Hsü's contemplation and his night imagery: "Many a questioning mind has stealthily entered thy courtyard and roamed through thy lampless house seeking for answers."(330) Moreover, the night is naturally linked with mysterious beauty which Hsü admires. But in Hsü, the general mood of the night in "Night" soon changes. After his return to China, inscrutability, helplessness, sorrow and even death dominate the night scenes in his works - the atmosphere is less like that surrounding Juliet's balcony than like that enveloping Macbeth's castle. Deepening the dreariness of the night, other related images such as graves and

wilderness (universal symbols of death and its associative objects), and fallen leaves and the season of autumn (typical Chinese symbols of sadness), abound. Such images naturally appeal to the disappointed and frustrated, the late T'ang poet Li Ho (李賀) is a case in point. Indeed, in terms of love, Hsü had every reason to indulge in them during the years of 1923-24.

Other images linked with the night like the moon, the stars, the dream, etc. also occupy a prominent place in Hsü. His stars, together with the mountain peak, often represent his ideal or ideals, and this is related to a basic aspect of his philosophy of life, or to put it more concretely, his striving spirit derived from Nietzsche. Both the stars and the mountain peak are of course high objects, spiritually and physically, for a pilgrim to struggle for. And Hsü is the very pilgrim that is a familiar allegorical figure in his verse. Ironically, the whole picture can be taken as a symbol of the poet's endeavour to win his "soul's companion" Lin Hui-yin, and later Lu Hsiao-man - the object too high, the outcome a failure.(331)

The images of small, light objects like grass, tiny flowers, snow flakes, little children, etc. in Hsü remind us of Tagore in whom these weak beings, all supposed to be animate, are symbols of lowliness, existing, as it were, for the strong to trample and slight; but from another point of view, they are symbols of strength and greatness, and the source of hope and joy to the world. In this connection Hsü is mainly concerned with the implications as he sees them of the latter group of associative meanings. He seldom, if ever, looks at these objects in the light of foreign oppression as Tagore does.(332)

N O T E S

(Chapter two)

1. The Chili men included Feng Kuo-chang (馮國璋), Ts'ao K'un (曹錕), Wu P'ei-fu (吳佩孚) and others, and the Fengtien clique was headed by Chang Tso-lin (張作霖).

2. There is a succinct account of it in Chan Wing-tsit, Religious Trends in Modern China, pp. 228-230. Jonathan T'ien-en Chao (comp.), A Bibliography of the History of Christianity in China, A Preliminary Draft, which is a recent publication relating to Christianity in China in different periods, gives information of a number of articles about the Anti-Religious Movement on pp. 29 f.

3. From Hsü's "Yin-tu yang shang ti ch'iu-szu" we can find his pessimism concerning his love affair even before he arrived in China. It would seem that Lin Hui-yin started to discourage him shortly after her leaving England.

4. See how Hsü expressed his wish in CW, V, p. 202 and VI, p. 31.

5. Ibid. Hsü also hinted at his wish to return to Europe in a letter to Roger Fry dated 5th June, 1923.

6. Liang's letter to his daughter was dated 7th Jan. 1923; see Ting Wen-chiang (ed.), op. cit. p. 632.

7. Ibid.

8. Liang Ch'i-ch'ao learned from Chang Chün-mai about what Hsü did in Europe; see his letter to Hsü in CW, I, p. 133.

9. See Ting Wen-chiang (ed.), op. cit. 632.

10. See Liang's letter to K'ang Yu-wei (康有為) and another one to his own daughter in Ting Wen-chiang (ed.), op. cit. pp. 644, 710 respectively.

11. See Liang's letter to his daughter in Ting Wen-chiang (ed.), op. cit. p. 733. This letter was written in 1927. Even in that year Liang could not be too sure of Lin Hui-yin's "mind" although the reference here was not about her attitude towards love.

12. Liang Szu-ch'eng and Lin Hui-yin were not formally engaged till 1927; they were married in 1928. See Ting Wen-chiang (ed.), op. cit. pp. 750 f., 756-758.

13. Lin Hui-yin's family liked the Liang family and suggested that she and Liang Szu-ch'eng be engaged in 1923. See Ting Wen-chiang (ed.), op. cit. p. 632.

14. See CW, I, p. 518.

15. Hsü's letter to Roger Fry dated 5th June, 1923. In this letter Hsü also told Fry that he wrote long letters to G. L. Dickinson about his private life. Such letters are not among Dickinson's papers; probably they have all been lost or destroyed.

16. For instance see this chapter, p.129 & CW. I, p.113; IV, pp. 488, 503, 507. In the last reference, the name Pao-pao (寶寶) is Lin Hui-yin.

17. During that period Hsü prepared with Lin Hui-yin and others to stage Tagore's play "Chitra";see this chapter,p.106. On a number of occasions Hsü and the girl accompanied Tagore in Peking; see Liang Shih-ch'iu, T'an Hsü Chih-mo, p. 51.

18. This unfinished letter is kept by Mr. L. K. Elmhirst.

19. Mr. L. K. Elmhirst told me that Hsü in 1925 or 1926 received news from Lin Hui-yin saying she wished to hear from him desperately. When Hsü was about to send a telegram in reply, he discovered that Hui-yin in fact did not send the news to him exclusively. He was at once convinced that the girl was after all not really in love with him but just enjoyed the game of being chased by him and others. His love for her died at that moment, and he wrote the poem "Na-hui pa, lao-chia, hsien-sheng", recording his disillusionment. Like some other poems excluded in Hsü's subsequent collected works, it is not included in CW - the editors of CW apparently did not succeed in locating it in CPFK.

20. See Ting Wen-chiang (ed.), op. cit. p. 654.

21. Their friendship started probably first in the Crescent Moon Society; see Ch'en Hsi-ying, "Kuan-yü Hsin-yüeh she", p. 24.

22. See Chang Chün-ku, op. cit. p. 333.

23. Leo Ou-fan Lee, op. cit. p. 272.

24. CW, III, pp. 338 f.

25. See chapter 4, pp. 284 f.

26. See CW, IV, pp. 345-347.

27. See CW, IV, pp. 251, 418.

28. See CW, IV, pp. 278-279, 292 f.

29. See CW, IV, pp. 409, 420.

30. See Ting Wen-chiang (ed.), op. cit. p. 710.

31. Liang was lecturing in Nanking at that time. See Ting Wen-chiang (ed.), op. cit. p. 610 and CW, I, p. 578. Hsü's letter to Rgoer Fry dated 15th Dec. 1922 indicated that he went to Peking by the end of November, 1922.

32. See Chao Ching-shen's words in CW, I, p. 428 and Liang Shih-ch'iu, op. cit. p. 5.

33. See Ku I-ch'ao, Ku I-ch'ao ch'üan-chi, XII, p. 74 and Liang Shih-ch'iu, op. cit. p. 6. According to Ku, Hsü's talk was given on the last day of 1922, but Liang said it was given in autumn. Ku's account should be more accurate since Hsü did not arrive Peking till the end of November.

34. See Liang Shih-ch'iu, op. cit. p. 6.

35. Liang Shih-ch'iu's description of Hsü on that occasion was: "Hsü Chih-mo ... looked light-hearted and elegant, full of self-complacency." See Liang Shih-ch'iu, op. cit. p. 5.

36. See Liu Fu, "Feng-ta Ch'en T'ung-po hsien-sheng", p. 4.

37. Liang Shih-ch'iu gave a wrong title "Literature and Life" in his T'an Wen I-to, p. 8, and Constantine Tung basing on Liang also made the same mistake (see Tung, op. cit. p. 35). But Liang in T'an Hsü Chih-mo, p. 6 was quite correct.

38. See Roger Fry, "Art and Life", pp. 1-10.

39. See Hsü Chih-mo, "Art and Life", pp. 4 f.

40. Ibid. p. 3. The words were originally underlined.

41. Ibid. pp. 7 f. The words were originally underlined. Similar views can also be seen on p. 12 in the article.

42. See Roger Fry, op. cit. p. 6.

43. Hsü Chih-mo, op. cit. pp. 13 f.

44. See Edward Carpenter, "The Art and Life" in his Angel's Wings, pp. 210, 219.

45. See Ibid. p. 211.

46. Hsü Chih-mo, op. cit. p. 8. The words were originally underlined.

47. Ibid. p. 15. See also Walter Pater, The Renaissance, p. 158.

48. Hsü Chih-mo, op. cit. p. 4.

49. See CW, VI, p. 142.

50. Hsü Chih-mo, op. cit. p. 14.

51. See CW, III, p. 9. This Society was rather obscure; judging by its name, it must have been a literary one.

52. See Liang Shih-ch'iu, op. cit. p. 6.

53. See CW, III, p. 9.

54. See Liang Shih-ch'iu, op. cit. p. 6.

55. Wen I-to graduated and left Tsing Hua College a few months before Hsü came to give his talk, but his influence in the Literary Society remained. Wen certainly did not think it right to condemn everything Chinese.

56. See CW, III, p. 9; Chien Hsien-ai, "Tu liao 'Suan-hsüeh yü shih-jen' chih-hou".

57. See Chao Ching-shen's records of these lectures in CW, VI, pp. 131-154.

58. Hsü left China for Europe in March, 1925. Not long after he returned, he became an editor of the PCCP in October.

59. See CW, I, pp. 631, 635, 642, 650.

60. See CW, I, pp. 415-426, 427-434; III, pp. 619-623.

61. For instance he used Merejkovski's book The Romance of Leonardo da Vinci, which was only a translation, to teach his students English in Shanghai simply because he liked the idea of flying. See CW, III, p. 649.

62. See Hsü Chih-mo, "T'ien-hsia pen wu-shih".

63. In I:2, 1922, pp. 1-15.

64. An obscure writer K'e Ch'uan mentioned it in only one sentence in his article "Shih-nien lai Chung-kuo ti wen-t'an", p. 156.

65. See [the Editor] ,"The Returned Student", pp. 493 f. and also Kuo Mo-jo, Ch'uang-tsao shih-nien, p. 118.

66. Kuo Mo-jo, Mo-jo shu-hsin chi, p. 98.

67. The name of this well-known literary society has been variously translated into English as Literary Research Society, Society for Literary Studies, Society for the Study of Literature, etc. In fact the Chinese characters yen-chiu (研究) do not seem to mean "research" or "study" or "studies" here; rather, they are probably supposed to mean gathering together to have friendly discussion and exchange of opinions. This can be appreciated from the "Manifesto" of the organization (see Hsiao-shuo yüeh-pao, XII:1, 1921, pp. 1 f.); and the original English name of the Society "The Literary Association" is an appropriate translation.

68. For the invitation extended to Kuo Mo-jo by the Literary Association and the clash between the Creation Society and the Association see Kuo Mo-jo, Ke-ming ch'un-ch'iu, pp. 92, 94, 116, 133 f.

69. See Wang Che-fu, Chung-kuo hsin wen-hsüeh yün-tung shih, p. 62. Chou Tso-jen also wrote about how criticism

often became a personal attack among modern Chinese writers; see his T'an hu chi, p. 29.

70. Yü was a fairly active politician in modern China especially in the 1940's. He studied for a short while in England.

71. For this episode between Hu Shih and the Creation Society see Kuo Mo-jo, Ch'uang-tsao shih-nien, pp. 220, 234. I have not been able to obtain the following relevant material: (a) Yü Ta-fu, "Hsi-yang lou jih-chi" (夕陽樓日記) (The Diary of the Sunset Tower), (b)Hu Shih's criticism of the Creation Society writers and (c) Ch'en Hsi-ying's criticism of Kuo Mo-jo's translation. The quotation "shallow and frivolous without knowing it" is from Kuo Mo-jo's Ch'uang-tsao shih-nien, p. 220, and Yü Ta-fu's wanting to commit suicide is also from the same source.

72. Hsü saw the Creation Society people in Shanghai shortly after he returned to China and could not have got acquainted with Hu Shih till he arrived in Peking at least a few days later; see Hsü Chih-mo, "T'ien-hsia pen wu-shih".

73. The first letter in [Ch'eng Fang-wu (comp.)], "T'ung-hsin szu tse", p. 13.

74. The second letter in Ibid. pp. 13 f. Although it is clear that Hsü laughed at Chang Tung-sun in his letter to Ch'eng Fang-wu, the real cause was not mentioned.

75. See the essay reprinted in CW, VI, pp. 107-117.

76. See CW, VI, pp. 115-116. The term "fake poetry" was used by Hsü in its English original.

77. See the fourth letter in [Ch'eng Fang-wu (comp.)], op. cit. p. 15.

78. See Hsü Chih-mo, "T'ien-hsia pen wu-shih".

79. Liang Shih-ch'iu became acquainted with the Creation Society people in either 1921 or 1922; see his Ch'iu-shih tsa-i, p. 41. But it is not true as Constantine Tung affirmed that Liang and Wen I-to became "members" of the Society in 1921; see Tung op. cit. p. 33.

80. See the first letter in [Ch'eng Fang-wu (comp.)] "T'ung-hsin erh tse", pp. 13 f.

81. See CW, IV, p. 499 and Kuo Mo-jo, Ch'uang-tsao shih-nien, p. 247.

82. See CW, IV, pp. 500, 504.

83. See Hsü Chih-mo, "Wo wei-shen-mo lai pan wo hsiang chen-mo-pan".

84. See Kuo Mo-jo, Mo-jo wen-chi, X, p. 351.

85. See [the Editor] "Modern Chinese Poetry", p. 5.

86. See CW, IV, p. 499. What Hsü meant by Kuo's regression must have been the prosaic elements in Kuo's poems dealing mainly with revolutionary thought or slogans. See the collection entitled Ch'ien-mao (前矛) (Spearhead) in Kuo's Mo-jo wen-chi, I, 1957.

87. Yü Ta-fu, Ta-fu san-wen chi, p. 243.

88. Whether Yü Ta-fu was a revolutionary, or how revolutionary Yü Ta-fu was, is an interesting question and has engaged the attention of many people. Literary historians in socialist countries tend to emphasize and commend his rebellious spirit and forgive his decadent life which, though clearly shown in his diary and other people's witnessing, is often overlooked by them. The Czech scholars seem to be especially inclined to defend him. The Chinese in mainland China, however, pay more respect to facts than the Czechs in this case; and while they also stress Yü's patriotism and revolutionary outbursts in different periods of his life, they neither cover up his inconsistency in politics and decadence in life nor defend them. People living outside the communist world generally present a more comprehensive picture of Yü and on the whole agree on Yü being essentially a petty-bourgeois romantic who became "revolutionary" when in straightened circumstances, turned decadent when having some money to spend on women and wine, and enjoyed himself in his own small self-contained world when ensured of a comfortable life. This relatively objective view is borne out by Yü's words of himself: "A pure soul. A proud character. Weak in emotion. Wavering in principle." As to Yü's associates of the Creation Society like Kuo Mo-jo and Wang Tu-ch'ing (王獨清), they gave him up as

a "dead" man who had politically degenerated in the mid-twenties. But Kuo never seriously treated Yü as an enemy; he did criticize him, though. See the following writings representing different opinions concerning Yü: Jaroslav Průšek, "Basic Problems of the History of Modern Chinese Literature and C. T. Hsia, A History of Modern Chinese Fiction", p. 399 and Three Sketches of Chinese Literature, pp. 90, 91, 98; Anna Dolezalova-Vlckova, "Remarks on the Life and Work of Yü Ta-fu up to 1930", pp. 74 f. and "Quelques Remarques sur la Question de l'Auto-description chez Yü Ta-fu", pp. 56-61; Ting I, "Yü Ta-fu hsüan-chi hsü", pp. 224-234; Wang Yao, Chung-kuo hsin wen-hsüeh shih kao, pp. 98 f; Chang Pi-lai, Hsin wen-hsüeh shih kang, I, pp. 83-85; Liu Shou-sung, Chung-kuo hsin wen-hsüeh shih ch'u-kao, pp. 175 f.; C. T. Hsia, A History of Modern Chinese Fiction, pp. 109-111 and "On the 'Scientific' Study of Modern Chinese Literature", p. 471; Chao Ts'ung, Sa nien-tai wen-t'an tien-chiang lu, p. 80; Cheng Hsüeh-chia, Yu wen-hsüeh ke-ming tao ke wen-hsüeh ti ming, pp. 36-39; Huang Jen-ying (ed.), Ch'uang-tsao she lun, p.208; Kuo Mo-jo, T'ien-ti hsüan huang, p. 597. When making the statement that Yü Ta-fu took part in "revolutionary movements", Bonnie S. McDougall most probably had in mind Yü's short stay in Canton in 1926. At that time Yü was teaching at Sun Yat-sen University, leading the life of a Bohemian decadent; there was nothing revolutionary about his work or sojourn there. See McDougall, op. cit. 216. Anna Doležalová in her recent publication Yü Ta-fu, Specific Traits of His Literary Creation, p. 133 (the book being translated by P. Tkáč) holds firm to her old view that Yü was basically revolutionary and not decadent; but she cannot substantiate her opinion with defensible evidence. It is clear that basing oneself only on part of Yü's writings to draw conclusions about Yü Ta-fu the man and his thought can be very misleading.

89. See Yü Ta-fu, Yü Ta-fu ch'üan-chi, pp. 315, 324, 326, 327, 329, 344, 358, 401, 417-419, 421, 424 f. for the close relationship between Yü Ta-fu and Hsü Chih-mo and Hsü's friends in their Shanghai period; but it is by no means true that Yü attended meetings presided over by Hu Shih concerning the publication of the Crescent Moon Monthly as alleged by Huang Jen-ying (ed.), op. cit. p. 76. Such allegation must have been based on Mai K'e-ang [Kuo Mo-jo] , "Wen-hsüeh ke-ming chih hui-ku", p. 86. By the way, the Ch'üan-chi cited above is by no means complete.

90. See Liang Shih-ch'iu, "Hsü Chih-mo yü 'Hsin-yüeh' ", p. 21.

91. See CW, I, pp. 375-383.

92. See Yü Ta-fu, "Huai szu-shih sui ti Chih-mo", pp. 364 f. The quoted verses are from Shelley's "Adonais", XXXIV.

93. See Mai K'e-ang, op. cit. p. 86.

94. See the first few essays in Yü Ta-fu, Ch'i-ling chi.

95. See the third letter by Hung Wei-fa in [Ch'eng Fang-wu (comp.)], "T'ung-hsin szu tse", pp. 14 f. and the first letter by Liang Shih-ch'iu in [Ch'eng Fang-wu (comp.)], "T'ung-hsin erh tse", pp. 13-15.

96. For the background of the poem see Kuo Mo-jo, Ch'uang-tsao shih-nien, pp. 139-141.

97. Kuo Mo-jo probably borrowed the expression from Ch'ü Yüan (屈原)'s Ch'u-tz'u (楚辭) (The Songs of Ch'u) where lang-lang (浪浪) (waves) is used to describe the profuse flow of tears.

98. This letter was written for the most part in English, but these few lines were in Chinese. The Chinese title of the book cited is Chung-kuo hsiao-shuo shih lüeh (中國小說史略).

99. Hsü Chih-mo, "Szu-shih", pp. 5-7. CW, II, pp. 481-487 gives only the translated poem without the article, or prologue.

100. This satire appeared in Yü-szu magazine, No. 5 , 1924, pp. 4 f. and was included in his prose collection Chi wai chi (集外集) (Collection Outside Collections).

101. See Liu Fu, "Hsü Chih-mo hsien-sheng ti erh-to", pp. 6 f.; "Pa-li t'ung-hsin", pp. 1-3; "Ma hsia-liao-yen ti wen-hsüeh shih chia", pp. 1 f.; Wang Ching-chih, "Tso shih chih tz'u-hsü"; Fei Tzu, "Hsü Chih-mo hsien-sheng ti ch'ang-shih".

102. Lu Hsün, op. cit. XXII, p. 11.

103. Li Chin-fa first used his original name Li Shu-liang (李淑良) when contributing poems to Yü-szu magazine. He appeared in that publication as Li Chin-fa beginning in August, 1925; see Yü-szu, No. 41, 1925, p. 6.

104. See Rabindranath Tagore, Fruit Gathering, p. 13.

105. See Kuo Mo-jo, "Lun chieh-tsou", p. 2.

106. CW, I, p. 371.

107. Lu Hsün's brother Chou Tso-jen once said that the educated people of the eastern part of Chekiang province were temperamentally prone to enjoying scolding others; see Chou Tso-jen, Yü-t'ien ti shu, p. 5.

108. The quotation is from a letter written by Lu Hsün to a friend some time in August or September, 1923; see Hsü Kuang-p'ing (ed.), Lu Hsün shu-chien, p. 5.

109. Lu Hsün hsien-sheng chi-nien wei-yüan-hui (ed.), Lu Hsün ch'üan-chi, VI, p. 13.

110. Lu Hsün in Lu Hsün san-shih nien chi, XVIII, pp. 160-171 gave the impression that Yü-szu was not intolerant, saying that some writers' discontinuance of contributing to it was due to their own changed attitude towards the magazine. Actually this is not quite true. Evidently Hsü Chih-mo was "shut out" by him (see this chapter, p. 93) and further, when Ku I-ch'ao sent an open letter to the magazine addressing Hsü and suggesting friendly co-operation among all writers, the letter, written some time after Lu Hsün's attack on Hsü, was either returned to Ku or destroyed, for it was never published in Yü-szu. For information about Ku's letter see Ku I-ch'ao, op. cit. XII, p. 80.

111. Hsü Chih-mo (tr.), "Tsai i-chia fan-tien li", p. 5.

112. Lin Yutang's praise of Hsü Chih-mo's literary talent can be seen in the following publications: CW, I, p. 641; Lin Yutang, Wu so pu t'an, pp. 7, 32; Lin Yutang, Yü-t'ang sui-pi, p. 237; K. E. Priestley (ed.), China's Men of Letters Yesterday and Today, p. 26.

113. Hsü became acquainted with Cheng Chen-to at the same time as he first made friends with the members of the Creation Society. A little misunderstanding arose when Ch'eng Fang-wu published Hsü's private letters but it did not last long; see Hsü Chih-mo, "T'ien-hsia pen wu-shih". For the friendship between Hsü and Cheng see CW, I, p. 610; IV, p. 507; VI, p. 459. As to Wang

T'ung-chao, see Wang, P'ien yün chi, pp. 145, 150-152. Ch'ü Chü-nung was educated in America and Hsü may have known him years before. Wang and Ch'ü also helped Hsü to make arrangements for Taogre's visit to Shantung province; see Hsü, "T'ai-ku-erh chui-chin hsiao-hsi". The addressee of this letter, Chien-san (劍三), is Wang T'ung-chao; see also Wang's report to CPFK, 23rd Apr. 1924, For more about Hsü and Ch'ü see this chapter,note No.234;chapter 3, p. 227.

114. See chapter 1, p. 18 for Hsü's acquaintance with Ch'en.

115. See Lu Hsün, Lu Hsün san-shih nien chi, XII, p. 70; Hsü Chih-mo, " 'Hsien-hua' yin ch'u lai ti hsien-hua".

116. See Hsü's letters to Bertrand Russell dated 7th Nov. 1921 and to Roger Fry dated 5th June, 1923 respectively.

117. Hsü's letter to L. K. Elmhirst dated 5th March, 1929.

118. See CW, I, p. 578. Liang Ch'i-ch'ao was in Nanking at that time. Hsü's going to those lectures must have been encouraged or urged by Liang who attended them (see Ting Wen-chiang (ed.), op. cit. p. 628). As to his promise to Liang, it was never fulfilled.

119. See CW, I, p. 134.

120. CW, I, pp. 361 f.

121. CW, I, 362.

122. See Chang Chün-ku, op. cit. pp. 231-235, and also Leo Ou-fan Lee, op. cit. pp. 264-266.

123. These are the main aspects of Liang Ch'i-ch'ao's letter to Hsü dated 2nd Jan. 1923 (see CW, I, pp. 133-136); I see no reason to doubt Liang's sincerity.

124. See Ting Wen-chiang (ed.), op. cit. p. 552.

125. See Ting Wen-chiang (ed.), op. cit. p. 640.

126. See CW, I, p. 582, 584.

127. See Hsü's letter to L. K. Elmhirst dated 22nd Jan. 1924; Hsü's letter to Roger Fry dated 5th June, 1923; Hsü's letter to Tagore (exact date unknown, presumably either in late 1923 or early 1924 as quoted in Stephen N. Hay,

op. cit. p. 194 and Note 24 on page 380 in his book); CW, IV, p. 510.

128. See Chang Chün-ku, op. cit. pp. 261, 265, 289. I accept Chang's account related to this point on the ground that both Liang and Hsü were in Peking during that period and that the following incidents can be regarded as evidence: (a) Hsü was a sort of secretary of the Lecture Association the president of which was Liang. (b) Hsü was responsible for English correspondence of Liang's Sung-p'o Library. (c) Hsü sometimes acted as advisor to Liang as shown in his suggestion concerning Liang's son Liang Szu-ch'eng's study abroad (see Ting Wen-chiang (ed.), op. cit. p. 647). (d) Obviously Hsü followed Liang and Liang's children to Pei-tai-ho (北戴河) for summer holidays in August (see CW, III, pp. 445-450 and Ting Wen-chiang (ed.), op. cit. pp. 648 f.).

129. For all the important polemical writings concerning the Controversy over the Philosophy of Life see Ya-tung t'u-shu-kuan (ed.), K'o-hsüeh yü jen-sheng-kuan. Chang Chün-mai, one of the main figures in this controversy, continued to write about it in later years; see his "Jen-sheng-kuan lun-chan chih hui-ku" (two different articles of the same title). A succinct account of the controversy in English can be seen in William Theodore de Bary et al (comp.), Sources of Chinese Tradition, II, pp. 172 f. Another one is Chan Wing-tsit, Religious Trends in Modern China, pp. 233-235. Chan's conclusion is quite different from most people's in that he said: "Actually ... religion won an important battle". As for Liang Ch'i-ch'ao's intention of intervention see Ting Wen-chiang (ed.), op. cit. pp. 644 f.

130. See Ting Wen-chiang (ed.), op. cit. p. 710.

131. See Ting Wen-chiang (ed.), op. cit. p. 666.

132. See Ting Wen-chiang (ed.), op. cit. p. 710. See also Liang Shih-ch'iu, T'an Hsü Chih-mo, p. 13.

133. See Ting Wen-chiang (ed.), op. cit. p. 710.

134. See CW, I, pp. 647 f.

135. See Ting Wen-chiang (ed.), op. cit. p. 632.

136. See this chapter, pp. 122, 137; chapter 3, pp. 200 f.; chapter 4, pp. 328 f.

137. See this chapter, p. 4; CW, IV, p. 346.

138. See chapter 1, pp. 12 f.; CW, IV, pp. 503, 527; I, p. 662; chapter 4, p. 301.

139. These are Liang's words; see Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, Liang Jen-kung shih-kao shou-chi, p. 97.

140. Lun-yü (論語) (Analects), XIX, 13.

141. See chapter 1, pp. 12 f.

142. See CW, IV, p. 266.

143. See all his activities as recorded chronologically in CW, I, pp. 578-661.

144. See chapter 1, p. 10.

145. See Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, Yin-ping shih wen-chi, IV, No. 10, pp. 6-9.

146. Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, "Kuo-hsüeh ju-men shu yao-mu chi ch'i tu-fa" (國學入門書要目及其讀法) (Essential Items of Books of Introduction to Chinese Studies and the Methods in Relation to the Study of Them) in his Yin-ping shih chuan-chi, No. 71, pp. 1-21.

147. See this chapter, p. 83.

148. See Hu Shih, Hu Shih wen-tsun, II, pp. 206-208. Hsü's writing style can also be seen from the translations in the present thesis.

149. It is clear from previous pages that as a rule I use English translations of Chinese terms after giving the Chinese originals and their romanized forms. In the case of Hsin-yüeh and its derivatives, however, the Chinese originals must be restored again and again in the discussion to indicate the complexity therein.

150. The information about these eating-societies is from Jermyn Chi-hung Lynn, Social Life of the Chinese in Peking. Even nowadays, such societies still exist among the Chinese outside the People's Republic. In Hong Kong, the vulgar name for them is ta-shih hui (大食會) (gourmands' societies).

151. See CW, IV, p. 503.

152. See Hsü's letter to Arthur Waley dated 21st Feb. 1924; see also Hsü Chih-mo, "Wo wei-shen-mo lai pan wo hsiang tsen-mo pan".

153. The Club house was situated at No. 7, Sung-shu hu-t'ung (松樹胡同) (Pine Lane); see Hsü Chih-mo, "O yu man-lu -ti-i han kei Hsin-yüeh- "; CW, VI, p. 267. But CW, I, p. 599 gives the name of the lane as Chung-chieh (中街) (Central Street).

154. Hsü Chih-mo, "O yu man-lu -ti-i han kei Hsin-yüeh- ".

155. Ibid.

156. Ibid.

157. For the renting of the house see CW, I, p. 599. Ch'en Yüan was of the opinion that the formation of the Crescent Moon Society took place after Tagore's departure when the house was acquired; see his "Kuan-yü 'Hsin-yüeh she' ", p. 23.

158. See PCCP, 10th May, 1924, p. 6 which reported the dramatic activities of the Society. See also Hsiung Fo-hsi, "Chung-hua hsi-chü kai-chin she ti hsin hsiao-hsi".

159. Se CW, VI, p. 477.

160. See CW, VI, p. 267.

161. See Lin Yutang, "Kei Hsüan-t'ung ti hsin", p. 4; Ch'üan, "I-ko hsiao-hsiao ti chien-i".

162. See Hsü Chih-mo,"O yu man-lu -ti-i han kei Hsin-yüeh- ".

163. Ibid.

164. CW, IV, p. 375.

165. See Hsü Chih-mo, op. cit. Incidentally, a complete list of the Society's members does not seem to have survived; according to Ch'en Yüan (see Ch'en, op. cit. 23), Ling Shu-hua (information obtained from an interview) and Liang Shih-ch'iu (information obtained from an interview), the more prominent members were Hsü Chih-mo, Hu Shih, Lin Ch'ang-min, Ting Hsi-lin (丁西林),

Ch'en Po-sheng (陳博生), Chang Chün-mai and his brothers, Hsü Hsin-liu (徐新六), Wang Keng and his wife Lu Hsiao-man, Huang Tzu-mei (黃子美) et al of whom only some were men of letters in the strict sense. Ch'en Yüan and his wife Ling Shu-hua were also members but Liang Shih-ch'iu, often mistaken for a member of it, was not, for when the Society was functioning, he was still a student in America. Wen I-to did go to the Club once or twice, but did not like it. Yeh Kung-ch'ao told me in an interview that Lin Yutang was also a member.

Ch'en Ts'ung-chou in his book (op. cit. p. 59) gave a highly erroneous picture of the Crescent Moon Society as to its year of foundation and the names of its members.

166. CW, VI, p. 267.

167. Information obtained from Madam Ling Shu-hua in an interview. See also Ch'en Yüan, op. cit. p. 23. In view of the short-lived activities of the Crescent Moon Society, I find it hard to agree with Constantine Tung (Tung, op. cit. pp. 43, 57) who said the Society "came to represent an influential current in literary, cultural and even political circles in Peking". Tung obviously had in mind the Endeavour, the Contemporary Review and the Poetry Magazine of the PCCP when making that remark. Akiyoshi Kukio made a similar statement in his "Gendai Chugoku-shi no hoko", p. 194. It seems to me that to associate these three publications with the Crescent Moon Society is to make a forced connection.

168. See Ch'en Yüan, op. cit. p. 23.

169. CW, VI, p. 277.

170. Hsü gave the information in the Poetry Magazine (Shanghai), No. 3, 1931, p. 4 that there was a branch of Crescent Moon Book Co. in Canton the manager of which was Lin Wei-yin (林微音), a minor writer.

171. See Liang Shih-ch'iu, Ch'iu-shih tsa-i, p. 67.

172. See Liang Shih-ch'iu, T'an Hsü Chih-mo, pp. 28 f.

173. CW, VI, p. 277.

174. Journalistic writings erroneously treating the Crescent Moon Society as a literary society devoted to pai-hua regulated poetry and formed either in 1925 or 1928 are just too many; it is not worthwhile to list them here. As to scholarly works imparting more or less the same information, the student of modern Chinese literature may easily come into contact with the following: J. R. Hightower, Topics in Chinese Literature, p. 105; Liu Wu-chi and Li T'ien-yi, Readings in Contemporary Chinese Literature, xxvii f.; Huang Sung-k'ang, Lu Hsün and the New Culture Movement of Modern China, p. 127; Chow Tse-tsung, The May Fourth Movement, p. 287; Patricia Guillermaz, La Poésie Chinoise Contemporaire, p. 49; Kai-yu Hsu, Twentieth Century Chinese Poetry, p. 49; Lai Ming, A History of Chinese Literature, p. 355; Yi-tsi M. Feuerwerker, "Tradition and Experiment in Modern Chinese Literature", 173; Howard L. Boorman (ed.), Biographical Dictionary of Republican China , I, pp. 123, 353; Amitendranath Tagore, Literary Debates in Modern China, pp. 21, 67, 69 f.; Marián Gálik, Mao Tun and Modern Chinese Literary Criticism, p. 46; Angela J. Palandri, "Contemporary Chinese Poetry from Taiwan", p. 72; Constantine Tung, op. cit. passim. In addition, Chow Tse-tsung reports that the Crescent Moon Society advocated "symbolism"; Kai-yu Hsu is of the opinion that the Crescent Moon Society was founded in Wen I-to's house; Lai Ming alleges that the Society was formed after the May 30th Incident in 1925 and it "stood for symbolism"; the essay about Hsü Chih-mo in Howard L. Boorman's book states that Hsü was not a founder of but was "in close contact with" the Society which was founded by Hu Shih, Liang Shih-ch'iu. Lo Lung-chi, P'an Kuang-tan and Wen I-to; the essay on Liang Shih-ch'iu in the same book, however, affirms that Hsü Chih-mo, Liang Shih-ch'iu and Hu Shih were founders of the Society; A. Tagore calls the Society a literary one given birth in 1923 and the poets' contributing to the Poetry Magazine of CPFK in 1926 was supposed to be part of the literary activity of the Society; Angela J. Palandri dates the formation of the Society as a poetry society as early as 1921; Constantine Tung, though aware of the existence of the Crescent Moon Society, Peking, thinks that another one was formed in Shanghai in 1928 (see his thesis, pp. 7, 43,45, 65, especially note 35). Some of the confusion that would seem to apply to others too in his work is owing to the indiscriminate application of the term

Crescent Moon Society; Stephen N. Hay first uses the term "Crescent Moon Scoiety" and later changes to "Crescent Moon Club" which he equates with Hsin-yüeh p'ai (新月派). He informs us that Wen I-to and Hsü Chih-mo "collaborated in re-founding the Crescent Moon Club" in 1926 and they met with others in a spacious house of Hsü's in Peking. His information is from oral sources and his informants' memory is evidently at fault; see Hay, op. cit. pp. 166, 197 and note 58 on p. 373. As to the voluminous Hsin wen-hsüeh ta-hsi hsü-pien (ed. and comp. by Hsiang-kang wen-hsüeh yen-chiu she), which is probably an essential item in all libraries with a modern Chinese literature collection, it may prove a pitfall to the less well-informed student with regard to the information of the Crescent Moon group given therein. It implies that the Crescent Moon Society was formed by Hu Shih, Hsü Chih-mo, Liang Shih-ch'iu and Shen Ts'ung-wen in Shanghai in 1928 (see I, p. 30), and when dealing with poetry, it states that Hsü and Shen are the representatives of Hsin-yüeh p'ai, upholding "anti-realistic views" (see I, p. 11); but in another section it says Hsin-yüeh p'ai was formed by Hsü Chih-mo, Chu Hsiang and Ch'en Meng-chia (see VIII, p. 36) and "Hsin-yüeh p'ai founded the Crescent Moon Monthly" (see VIII, p. 76). All this is inaccurate and confusing, and it also reveals the fact that the editors of these "introductory essays" attempt to whitewash the reputation of Wen I-to and make Shen Ts'ung-wen a villain. Last but not least, I should think P. Henri van Boven's book, i.e., Histoire de la Littérature Chinoise Moderne may have been the origin of some errors in the scholarly works listed above. In spite of one or two favourable remarks on it by Průšek for its "renseignements", it must be used with considerable caution not because of its Roman Catholic point of view, which is on the whole only moderate and is no more "harmful" than any other left or right political orientations in many publications, but because of the inaccuracy of some of its "renseignements".

Incidentally, there have been in recent years a Hsin-yüeh ch'u-pan she (新月出版社) (Crescent Moon Press) at 122 Su-hang Street (蘇杭街), Hong Kong and a Hsin-yüeh t'u-shu kung-szu (新月圖書公司) (Crescent Moon Book Co.) in Taipei (see Free China Review, Sept. 1971, p. 43). These organizations are not connected with the Crescent Moon Society or the Crescent Moon Book Co. in the twenties.

175. See Chao Ching-shen, Wen-jen chien-ying, p. 41; Tung-fang Hsi, Ch'iu-ch'uang chi, p. 200; Yang Chih-hua (ed.), Wen-t'an shih-liao, p. 374; Ts'ai I, Chung-kuo hsin wen-hsüeh shih chiang-hua, p. 59.

176. See Chao Chia-pi (ed.), Chung-kuo hsin wen-hsüeh ta-hsi, X, pp. 383-390. A typical brief account can be seen in Ch'en Hsiang-ho, "Kuan-yü Ch'en-chung she ti kuo-ch'ü hsien-tsai chi chiang-lai", pp. 193-201. In present days such small, informal literary societies still exist among the Chinese literary people outside mainland China as friendly groups advocating their respective literary doctrines and, not infrequently, fighting their respective "pen-wars". Many of them just rise and fall like waves in the sea. Their ephemeral existence is often due to shortage of funds. In the People's Republic, however, such a phenomenon does not seem to be present since any individual organizations, literary or otherwise, can hardly grow on communist soil. Many of the she (社) there are highly organized branches of government departments or ministries.

177. See the page preceding the fly-leaf at the end of all the issues of the Poetry Magazine.

178. Tsang K'e-chia, Chung-kuo hsin-shih hsüan, p. 20.

179. Liang Shih-ch'iu, Ch'iu-shih tsa-i, p. 65.

180. Ibid. p. 66; see also his Shih-ch'iu tsa-wen, p. 72. Liang's words are well-founded in the light of how Lu Hsün used Hsin-yüeh p'ai (新月派) but referred to the Society he belonged to as Yü-szu she (語絲社); see Lu Hsün, Lu Hsün san-shih nien chi, XXII, p. 11.

181. Liang Shih-ch'iu, Ch'iu-shih tsa-i, p. 66.

182. See chapter 1, p. 37.

183. In the case of Wen I-to see this chapter, note No. 165 and also chapter 3, pp. 27 f.

184. See CW, VI, p. 251.

185. It is strange that Patricia Guillermaz should call the magazine a "revue poétique"; see Guillermaz, op. cit. pp. 16 f.

186. See chapter 3, pp. 218 f.

187. See CW, VI, p. 114.

188. This was Liang's opinion which was obtained in an interview in February, 1971.

189. Ting Yi uses "Crescent Moon Group" as well as "Crescent Moon Clique" in his A Short History of Modern Chinese Literature, pp. 33, 49, 51, 52, 184 f., 187, 207 f.; C. T. Hsia uses "Crescent Moon group"(Hsia, op. cit. p. 121; Y. C. Wang uses the term "Crescentists" in his Chinese Intellectuals and the West, 1872-1949 , p. 401; both Leo Ou-fan Lee and Constantine Tung use "Crescent Moon Group" and "Crescentists" in their respective theses, but Tung also equates "Crescent Moon Group" with "Crescent Moon Society"; see Lee, op. cit. pp. 286, 296 and Tung, op. cit. passim.

190. See Hsü's letter to Roger Fry dated 7th Aug. 1922.

191. "Peking Lectures Association" was the official English name of Chiang-hsüeh she (講學社) and Liang Ch'i-ch'ao was the president; see Stephen N. Hay, op. cit. p. 380, note No. 24; Hsü Chih-mo's letter to Roger Fry dated 15th Dec. 1922.

192. See Hsü's letter to Roger Fry dated 15th Dec. 1922.

193. Mrs. Pamela Diamand, Roger Fry's daughter, told me in an interview in Dec. 1971 that her father did want to go, but could not do so because of ill health.

194. Tagore's associate L. K. Elmhirst went to China in 1923 to make the first contact. It was agreed that Tagore was to go in August, but the visit was postponed to winter because of Tagore's illness. Winter being too cold, the visit was postponed again to the spring of 1924. See CW, VI, p. 475.

195. Driesch was invited to China by the Peking Lectures Association in 1922. Chang Chün-mai was his interpreter. Hsü could not do much simply because he did not speak German. For the sight-seeing in Shantung see Want T'ung-chao, "Wen-hsüeh ti tso-p'in yü tzu-jan"; cf. CW, VI, p. 459.

196. See Chiang Shao-yüan, "I-ko yen-chiu tsung-chao shih ti jen tui-yü T'ai-ko-erh kai tsen-yang hsiang ni".

197. The other enthusiasts in the literary circles were Cheng Chen-to and Wang T'ung-chao. Cheng, editor of Hsiao-shuo yüeh-pao, published two special issues on Tagore (XIV: 9 & 10), followed by another supplementary issue (XV:4). For Wang T'ung-chao see note No. 113 of this chapter.

198. CW, VI, p. 467.

199. See CW, VI, pp. 463-472.

200. For these activities see Chi Che, "T'ai-ko-erh tao hua ti ti-i tz'u chi-shih", pp. 7-16; Hsü Chih-mo, "T'ai-ku-erh tsui-chin hsiao-hsi"; CPFK, 23rd, 24th, 26th and 28th, Apr., all on p. 6; The North-China Heraled, 3rd May, 1924, pp. 167, 173; Rabindranath Tagore, Talks in China, pp. 102-107; Stephen N. Hay, op. cit. pp. 153 f., 156; see also this chapter, pp. 122 f.

201. See Hsü's note to Tagore which, undated, bears only "Saturday night" for date. From its content and also from the information provided in Stephen N. Hay, op. cit. pp. 173 f., it is clear that it was written on 17th May, 1924. Tagore was having a rest in Tangshan hot springs outside Peking, and Hsü on that particular night was in the city, being a little unwell.

202. See how they tried to upset Tagore by distributing handbills, etc. as reported in CPFK, 26th Apr. 1924, 10th May, 1924; in PCCP, 11th and 13th May, 1924, pp. 6 & 2 respectively. See also Stephen N. Hay, op. cit. pp. 162 f., 169 f.

203. See Stephen N. Hay, op. cit. pp. 204, 305. Chou Tso-jen in some of his essays also obliquely talked about the failure; see his T'an hu chi, pp. 128, 152. Wang Che-fu could hardly justify his opinion when he asserted that Tagore by his visit left an influence "both deep and tremendous" in Chinese literature (see his Chung-kuo hsin wen-hsüeh yün-tung shih, p. 68). Tagore's limited influence was conspicuous only for a short period when hsiao-shih (小詩) (short verse) was in vogue in 1921-22. For his influence on Hsü Chih-mo's writings see this chapter, p. 121.

204. See Hsü Chih-mo, "T'ai-ko-erh" and Hsü's postscript to his translation of Tagore's farewell speech in Hsiao-shuo yüeh-pao, XV;8, 1924, pp. 4 f.

205. [Rabindranath Tagore], "Some Pages from the President's Travel Diary", p. 386.

206. See Hsü's letter to Tagore dated 27th Dec. 1923.

207. The reference of the term can be seen in Chou Tso-jen, T'an hu chi, p. 128.

208. Tagore cancelled the last three lectures scheduled to take place on 13th to 15th May inclusive on account of the leftists' opposition. See Stephen N. Hay, op. cit. p. 173.

209. Hsü Chih-mo, "T'ai-ko-erh"; see also Hsü's postscript to his translation of Tagore's farewell speech in Hsiao-shuo yüeh-pao, XV:8, 1924, pp. 4 f.

210. See chapter 3, pp. 195-198.

211. All quotations are from Hsü's letter to Tagore dated 26th July, 1923.

212. See Hsü's letter to Tagore's associate C. F. Andrews. This letter, undated, must have been written in July, 1928 when Hsü was in New York.

213. See Hsü's letter to Tagore dated 30th Apr. 1925.

214. Hsü's letter to L. K. Elmhirst dated 18th June, 1925; the words of dedication on the page facing p. 1 in Tagore's Talks in China; Ch'en Yüan, "Kuan-yü Hsin-yüeh she", p. 24; the picture facing the title page in [L. K. Elmhirst (ed.)], Rabindranath Tagore, Pioneer in Education.

215. See note No. 214 of this chapter.

216. Tagore, Hsü and others left Shanghai on 30th May; after about four weeks' sojourn in Japan, they set sail back for Shanghai and then for Hong Kong, where they parted. See Stephen N. Hay, op. cit. p. 185 and Hsü's letter to Tagore dated 30th Apr. 1925.

217. CW, VI, p. 466.

218. See Kuo Mo-jo, Wen-i lun-chi, p. 238; Chu Tzu-ch'ing et al (ed.), Wen I-to ch'üan-chi, Ting chi (丁集), pp. 275-279. In fact Tagore's verse is not as formless as many people think it is; the truth is that in the original Bengali, as is reported by those who know the language, it is "full of subtlety of rhythm ... of metrical invention". See the "Introduction" by W. B. Yeats in Rabindranath Tagore, Gitanjali, p. xiii.

219. The two translated poems were not included by Hsü in any of his books; the one now in CW, I, p. 239 was not published in Hsü's life time and the other one was published in CPFK, 24th Nov. 1924. Hsü translated eight of Tagore's speeches; they were: "Ti i tz'u ti t'an-hua" (第一次的談話) (The First Talk), in Hsiao-shuo yüeh-pao, XV:8, 1924, pp. 6-8; "Ch'ing-hua yen-chiang" (清華演講) (Speech Given at Tsing Hua University), in CW, VI, pp. 493-508; "Kao-pieh tz'u" (告別辭) (A Farewell Speech), in Hsiao-shuo yüeh-pao, XV:8, 1924, pp. 1-4; "I-ko wen-hsüeh ke-ming chia ti kung-chuang" (一個文學革命家的供狀) (A Confession by A Revolutionary in Literature), in CW, VI, pp. 483-492; "Kuo-chi kuan-hsi" (國際關係) (The International Relations), in CW, VI, pp. 509-530; "K'o-hsüeh ti wei-chih" (科學的位置) (The Position of Science), in CW, VI, pp. 531-546; "Ta-pan nü-tzu huan-ying hui" (大阪女子歡迎會) (The Women's Welcome Party in Osaka), in CPFK, 15th Mar. 1925; "Fei-lai feng" (飛來峰) (The Peak of Fei-lai), in Ching-pao fu-k'an, 1st Mar. 1925.

220. See the title of Tagore's speech supplied by Hsü in CW, VI, p. 483.

221. See Hsü's letter to Tagore dated 30th Apr. 1925.

222. When Tagore was in China, Ts'ao K'un was president of the Republic. His welcome to Tagore was only semi-official (see Stephen N. Hay, op. cit. pp. 221 f.). Tuan Ch'i-jui took over the Peking government in November, 1924 and he probably saw some "use" in Tagore after learning of the latter's message given a few months before. Tuan's invitation to Tagore was conveyed by Lin Ch'ang-min whose letter was enclosed in Hsü's letter dated 30th Apr. 1925.

223. Tagore passed through China again in 1928 and 1929.

He was welcomed only by Hsü. On the last occasion he stayed in Hsü's home in Shanghai; see CW, I, pp. 632, 642.

224. CW, VI, p. 470

225. Rabindranath Tagore, Lectures and Addresses, p. 17.

226. See S. Radhakrishnan, The Philosophy of Rabindranath Tagore, p. 14; Tung Feng-ming, "T'ai-ko-erh chih tsai Nan-ching".

227. CW, III, p. 439.

228. Gilbert Reid was an American missionary who spent dozens of years in China (see K'ai Ming [Chou Tso-jen] , "Li Chia-po chih pu chieh", p. 6). The letter of introduction, now kept by L. K. Elmhirst, was written in Chinese, the signature being Li Chia-po (李佳白); for this Chinese name see H. G. W. Woodhead (ed.), China Year Book, 1925-26, Tientsin, p. 1069.

229. For Elmhirst's first visit to China, especially Shansi province see his "Some Impressions of China", pp. 211-220, particularly pp. 213 f.

230. L. K. Elmhirst, "Tagore and China", in Kalidas Nag (ed.), Tagore and China, p. 63; see also L. K. Elmhirst, "Tagore's Practical Plan for Sino-Indian Collaboration" (a mimeographed article) pp. 18-21. As to Jin-tse, I could not find it in any map and therefore its Chinese name is not available.

231. L. K. Elmhirst, "Tagore's Practical Plan for Sino-Indian Collaboration" (a mimeographed article), p. 20.

232. Ibid. p. 21.

233. Ibid. pp. 22 f.

234. Tagore seemed to have spoken about his plan only privately to Hsü Chih-mo, C. Y. Chu and P. C. Chang; see L. K. Elmhirst, ibid. p. 1. The PCCP (21st May 1924, p. 6), which reported the Shansi trip, carried no news of Tagore's special mission. C. Y. Chu should be C. N. Chu, i.e., Ch'ü Chü-nung (瞿菊農) or Ch'ü Shih-ying (瞿世英), and P. C. Chang was Chang

P'eng-ch'un (張 彭 春), then Dean of Tsing Hua University. L. K. Elmhirst was not always consistent with the spelling of Chinese names; the family name of Hsü, for instance, was written in different ways as Shu, Su and Hsu in his writings.

235. See L. K. Elmhirst, op. cit. p. 8.

236. See CW, III, p. 63. Hsü expressed such an opinion in late 1924 or early 1925.

237. See chapter 4, pp. 310 f.

238. Stephen N. Hay, op. cit. p. 193.

239. L. K. Elmhirst, "Tagore and China", in Kalidas Nag (ed.), Tagore and China, p. 63.

240. See Hsü Chih-mo, "T'ai-ko-erh".

241. Hsü Chih-mo's ambition and patriotism, his condemnation of the vices of the Chinese government and the weaknesses of the Chinese people (see chapter 1, pp. 11-13) and his support of the rural reconstruction project (see this chapter, pp. 122 f.), however naive his ideas, show his concern. As for Tagore, his social work and education campaign aimed at improving the character of his people as well as their material comfort is well-known; see for instance [L. K. Elmhirst (ed.)], Rabindranath Tagore, Pioneer in Education; D. Zbavitel, "Rabindranath Tagore in 1913-1930", pp. 374 f.; Krishna Kripalani, Rabindranath Tagore, pp. 161, 200, 265.

242. See CW, VI, p. 305

243. Tagore wished to initiate a programme of exchange of teaching staff with some Chinese universities, but his proposal, though warmly supported by Liang Ch'i-ch'ao and others, bore no fruit till he met T'an Yün-shan in Singapore in 1927; see Hsü Chih-mo, "T'ai-ko-erh chui-chin hsiao-hsi"; T'an Yün-shan, "The Visva-Bharati Cheena-Bhavana", in Kalidas Nag (ed.), Tagore and China, p. 22.

244. T'an Yün-shan, ibid, p. 22.

245. See L. K. Elmhirst, "Tagore and China", in Kalidas Nag (ed.) Tagore and China, p. 63.

246. See chapter 4, pp. 308-312 for the friendship between Hsü and Elmhirst.

247. A very small portion of the discussion on Hsü's poetical works in this and subsequent chapters is based on my unpublished M.A. thesis "The Poetry of Hsü Chih-mo".

248. The first edition of Chih-mo's Poems contains fifty-five pieces. The elimination of fifteen of them and the addition of "Lien-ai tao-ti shih shen-mo i-hui shih" (戀愛到底是甚麼一回事) (What Is Love after All) make up the forty-one poems in the subsequent editions. However, "Sha yang na la" (莎揚娜拉) (Sayonara), originally having eighteen stanzas, appears in only one stanza, namely the last, in the second and later editions. CW includes nine of the fifteen poems left out after the first edition; they are "Tzu-jan yü jen-sheng" (自然與人生) (Nature and Life), "Ti-chung-hai" (地中海) (The Mediterranean Sea), "Tung-shan hsiao-ch'ü" (東山小曲) (An Eastern Hill Ditty), "I hsiao fu ch'iung lo t'u" (一小幅窮樂圖) (A Sketch of Joy in Poverty), "Lei Feng t'a" (雷峰塔) (The Lei Feng Pagoda), "Ai Man-shu-fei-erh" (哀曼殊斐兒) (In Memory of Katherine Mansfield), "Hsi-wang ti mai-tsang" (希望的埋葬) (The Burial of A Hope), "Chung chung ti sui-yüeh" (塚中的歲月) (The Years in the Grave) and "K'ang-ch'iao tsai-hui pa" (康橋再會罷) (Farewell to Cambridge). I do not know whether China still has any copies of the first edition in her libraries, but as far as my research is concerned, I have seen a copy of it, printed on rice paper, at Feng P'ing-shan Library, University of Hong Kong; it might be the only copy existing in the non-communist world. Unfortunately, many pages of this rare volume are missing, and what still remains of interest to the researcher is only the table of contents, a poem entitled "Liu-pieh Jih-pen" (留別日本) (A Farewell Poem for Japan) and the complete version of "Sayonara". I have never seen the following: "Ch'ing-nien ch'ü" (青年曲) (A Song of Youth), "Mo-ching" (默境) (Silence) and "Yüeh-hsia tai tu-chüan pu-lai" (月下待杜鵑不來) (Waiting in the Moonlight for A Cuckoo That Does Not Come). CW, I, pp. 445-446 has two stanzas from "A Farewell Poem for Japan" quoted by Ch'en Meng-chia. I have also found four poems by Hsü which, published either in 1923 or 1924,

are not included in Chih-mo's Poems or any other collections of his. They are: "Hsiao hua-lan" (小花籃) (A Little Flower Basket), in CPFK, 23rd March, 1923 (written on 16th the same month); "Yeh" (夜) (Night), in CPFK, 1st Dec. 1923 (written in July, 1922); "Huan-hsiang" (幻想) (Fantasy), in Hsiao-shuo yüeh-pao, XIV:9, 1923, p. 6; "Kei mu-ch'in" (給母親) (To Mother), in CPFK, 31st Aug. 1924. It is believed that there are still a few more verses which, presumably of inferior quality, have not been included in any of his several collections.

249. Hsü became conscious of the shortcomings of his first collection soon after its publication. It might have been due to other people's criticism; see his post-script attached to Chou Jung, "Chih-mo ti shih". As to the dedication, it was removed in subsequent editions.

250. At that time a book of comparable size cost about Chinese $0.60 - 0.80 at most, but Chih-mo's Poems was sold per copy at $1.40 (rice paper edition) and $1.00 (lien-shih paper edition) respectively; see the advertisement in Hsien-tai p'ing-lun (現代評論), II:38, 1925, p. 2. Liang Shih-ch'iu's information about the first edition of Chih-mo's Poems is not quite accurate; apparently he is not aware of the rice paper edition; see his T'an Hsü Chih-mo, p. 40. Chiang Fu-ts'ung, however, remembers the rice paper edition but forgets the lien-shih paper one; see CW, I, p. 610.

251. See CW, II, p. 171.

252. Chu Hsiang classified Chih-mo's Poems into: prose poems; popular poems; philosophical poems; love poems and miscellaneous poems. This seems to me a confusion of form and content; see Chu Hsiang, "P'ing Hsü chün 'Chih-mo ti shih' ", p. 1.

253. See CW, VI, p. 115.

254. Mu Mu-t'ien, "Hsü Chih-mo lun -t'a ti szu-hsiang yü i-shu", p. 26. For opposite views see Harold Acton's introductory remarks in Harold Acton and Ch'en Shih-hsiang (ed. & tr.), Modern Chinese Poetry, pp. 20 f. Chu Tzu-ch'ing told us in his

Chu Tzu-ch'ing ch'üan-chi, II, p. 451 that he borrowed Acton's idea when he wrote "Tao-yen" (導言) (Introduction) (in Chao Chia-pi (ed.), Chung-kuo hsin wen-hsüeh ta-hsi, VIII, p. 7), which, on account of its importance in the volume as more or less an authoritative article, has become influential and Hsü's love poems are therefore often regarded as products from the poet's imagination rather than from his real life by those who, like Acton and Chu, are not familiar with Hsü's life and thought. Insofar as this point is concerned, a much less well-known writer Wang P'i-chiang has expressed a sounder opinion than Chu in his "Wo so jen-shih ti Hsü Chih-mo", p. 5.

255. CW, IV, p. 273.

256. All Hsü's poems cited in this paper will be left without references unless they are not in CW.

257. In my opinion, the verbal expressions and poetic atmosphere of this poems seem to indicate a "dead" love in a general way rather than the lament of a mother over her deceased son as the sixth stanza suggests. Occasionally Hsü does dramatize his love poems.

258. For the influence of d'Annunzio on Hsü see chapter 3, pp. 183-187.

259. See Chiang Fu-ts'ung, "Shih-hu chiu meng chi", p. 8. "Away" was first published under the title of "Shih i-shou" (詩一首) (A Poem) in Hsiao-shuo yüeh-pao, XV:4, 1924, p. 16, with a slightly different wording, and with the words "13th July" at the end. If this date is not a misprint, the poem must have been written in 1923. It was later published in CPFK (13th June, 1924) under the new title "Away". Stephen N. Hay gives the background of this poem in his book (op. cit. p. 195 and note No. 26 on p. 381), but I rather doubt its accuracy.

260. See Mu Mu-t'ien, op. cit. p. 24. Mu's essay is of a fairly high calibre, with a strong socialist point of view.

261. Chiang Fu-ts'ung claimed responsibility for the editing of Chih-mo's Poems (1st edition) and said the poems were arranged chronologically. But nobody with some knowledge of Hsü's poetry would believe his words

after glancing through the titles of the poems in the table of contents; there some pieces evidently written in 1924 precede others done in 1923. As to Chang Chün-ku's dating of Hsü's poems, it is based on his own imagination in most cases and is highly unreliable. See CW, I, pp. 31, 610; Chang Chün-ku, op. cit. passim.

262. Thomas Hardy, Collected Poems of Thomas Hardy, p. 75.

263. Ibid. p. 526.

264. See Ch'ien Hsing-ch'un, "Chung-kuo hsin-hsing wen-hsüeh lun", p. 158; Shao Hsien, "Ku-hsiang ti hsien-t'ien", pp. 447-466; CW, I, pp. 492, 498; Chang Pi-lai, Hsin wen-hsüeh shih kang, p. 129.

265. Literature of "blood and tears" was advocated by the Literary Association and "yelling and crying" was used by Hsü to ridicule the sentimental; see Chao Chia-pi (ed.), op. cit. II, p. 9; Kuo Mo-jo, Ke-ming ch'un-ch'iu, p. 133; CW VI, p. 113; CW, V, p. 427.

266. See CW, IV, pp. 503 f. It is not impossible that this poem has to do with a letter from Lin Hui-yin as Chang Chün-ku suggests (Chang, op. cit. p. 321).

267. Chu Hsiang, op. cit. p. 1. As far as Chih-mo's Poems is concerned, this critique of Chu's might be the best of its kind in spite of some bias against "philosophical" verse and some magisterial remarks. Chou Jung's critique (op. cit.), if it can be so called at all, is very inferior in comparison. From Hsü Chih-mo's postscript to Chou's essay we learn that quite a number of people criticized Chih-mo's Poems, but those critical essays do not seem to have survived and obviously they were not by the more renowned writers. Mao Tun's "Hsü Chih-mo lun" is not devoted exclusively to the study of Chih-mo's Poems , but he does have a great deal to say about it from a socialist viewpoint.

268. CW, III, p. 692.

269. When first appearing in Hsiao-shuo yüeh-pao (XV:8, 1924, p. 42) and CPFK (28th Sept. 1924), this poem carried a sub-title: "Chiang-nan chi-ching" (江南即景) (A Picture Right before the Eye to the South of the Yangtze River).

270. See this chapter, p. 120.

271. See CW, III, pp. 24-32.

272. So far as I know, Mu Mu-t'ien is the first critic to call attention to this point; see Mu, op. cit. p. 24.

273. See CW, III, pp. 661 f.

274. CW, III, p. 32.

275. See Mao Tun, op. cit. p. 521.

276. See Ta-hsüeh (大學) (The Great Learning), verse 4.

277. See chapter 1, p. 32.

278. See [Hsü Chih-mo], "Chüan t'ou yü". This "manifesto" was supposed to have been written by "All colleagues of this Publication"; I should think Hsü was the actual author. The term "szu-hsiang ke-ming" (思想革命) was apparently something Hsü inherited from Liang Ch'i-ch'ao.

279. See chapter 1, p. 35.

280. See CW, III, p. 396.

281. See CW, III, pp. 24-32, 660-662.

282. See CW, III, pp. 22-24.

283. For instance see Mao Tun, op. cit. and Yeh Ch'ing "Hsü Chih-mo lun", p. 70. Yeh Ch'ing, now known by his original name Jen Cho-hsüan (任卓宣), Kuomintang high official now retired in Taiwan, was a self-styled "orthodox" Marxist critic in the thirties. Later he turned to accept Sun Yat-sen's "Three Principles of the People". His critique is very arbitrary and didactic.

284. Mainly his association with Hu Shih, his anti-communist discussion conducted in CPFK (see chapter 3, p. 195-198) and his bourgeois origin.

285. See L. E. Cherkassky (ed. & tr.), Dozhdlivaya Alleya, pp. 86 f. This anthology of lyrics has twelve of Hsü's poems besides works by other poets.

It is interesting to note that some of Hsü's verses stigmatized by the Chinese communists as "decadent", are also included. The editor apparently does not know that "I-ko yen-shih jen ti mu-chih-ming" (一個厭世人的墓誌銘) is not Hsü's work but a translation of Thomas Hardy's "Cynic's Epitaph".

286. The Chinese term for this kind of verse is che-li shih (哲理詩), literally "philosophical verse" which I think suits less well than "reflective poems" in the case of Hsü.

287. See Chu Hsiang, op. cit. pp. 1, 3.

288. See ibid. p. 1. It is strange that Chu Hsiang should have regarded Hu Shih as a protagonist of "philosophical verse", Although there might be a little "philosophy" in Hu Shih's verse, he actually advised against the combination of philosophy and poetry; see Hu Shih, "Yü P'ing-po ti tung-yeh" (俞平伯的冬夜) (Yü P'ing-po's Winter Night), in his Hu Shih wen-ts'un, II, pp. 507-514.

289. Liang Shih-ch'iu, op. cit. p. 51.

290. "Tranquility and repose" is used by Hsü to describe not only an ideal state but an ideal person, his sweetheart Lu Hsiao-man; see CW, IV, p. 358.
Some background knowledge of this poem can be found in CW, IV, p. 495.

291. See CW, III, pp. 120 f.

292. The word "world" is here used in the meaning of the Chinese poetic term ching-chieh (境界) (a fusion of emotion and scene). The translation is James J. Y. Liu's and is, according to him, originally from the Sanskrit word visaya ("sphere" or "spiritual domain"). I follow Liu's usage. See James J. Y. Liu, The Art of Chinese Poetry, p. 84.

293. See Such poems as "Pu tsai shih wo ti kuai-kuai" (不再是我的乖乖) (No Longer My Darling), "To-hsieh t'ien wo ti hsin yu i-tu ti t'iao-tang" (多謝天我的心又一度的跳盪) (Thank Heaven! My Heart Leaps Up Once Again), "Ai Man-shu-fei-erh" (哀曼殊斐兒) (In Memory of Katherine Mansfield), and so on.

294. See CW, III, pp. 453 f., 472-475, 483 f., 488.

295. See CW, I, pp. 580, 586, 588, 596 f.

296. For instance see his elegy on Katherine Mansfield and his essay on his grandmother's death in CW, VI, pp. 67-70 and III, p. 475 respectively.

297. The original of the quotation is "shang hsia erh ch'iu so" (上下而求索), from Ch'ü Yüan (屈原). Lu Hsün quoted it and other words when he was in a state of searching for truth; see Lu Hsün hsien-sheng chi-nien wei-yüan-hui (ed.), Lu Hsün ch'üan-chi, II, (page bearing no number but preceding p. 5)

298. See CW, VI, p. 114.

299. See Cyril Birch, "English and Chinese Metres in Hsü Chih-mo", p. 280.

300. In this respect Liu Fu and Lu Chih-wei (陸志韋) may be regarded as Hsü's predecessors.

301. Kuo Mo-jo was under the spell of Tagore for a short period when he was still a student in Japan, but he did not write any "short verse"; nor did Wen I-to. Neither Kuo nor Wen made a point to attack "short verse" simply because they did not think much of it; but their attitude toward it was obvious in their writings about Tagore; see this chapter, p. 120 and note No. 218 ; Kuo Mo-jo, Wen-i lun-chi, p. 238; Chu Tzu-ch'ing et al (ed.) Wen I-to ch'üan-chi, Ting chi (丁集), pp. 275-279.

302. See Liang Shih-ch'iu, "Fan-hsing yü Ch'un-shui", pp. 4-9.

303. See CW, II, pp. 344 f., VI, pp. 251-253.

304. CW, VI, pp. 109 f.

305. CW, VI, p. 110.

306. CW, II, p. 344.

307. I find it hard to agree with Prof. Cyril Birch about Hsü's experiment with "English metre"; see discussion in chapter 3, p. 249.

308. See Chu Hsiang, op. cit. pp. 4-7.

309. See CW, VI, pp. 403-407.

310. See chapter 3, p. 184.

311. Quotations from CW, VI, pp. 28 f., 32.

312. Quotations from CW, II, pp. 84, 95, 104, 91.

313. CW, II, p. 39.

314. J. Průšek, "The Importance of Tradition in Chinese Literature", p. 220.

315. Liang Shih-ch'iu and Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai may well represent the two different opinions respectively; see Liang, op. cit. pp. 47 f.; Ch'ü, Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai wen-chi, I, pp. 254, 292, 631.

316. See for instance Chu Hsiang, op. cit. p. 11; Wang Che-fu, op. cit. p. 107; Huang Tsun-sheng, "Chung-kuo wen-t'i chih ou-hua wen-t'i yü yü-t'i wen-t'i", p. 50; Hsi Ying [Ch'en Yüan] , Hsi Ying hsien-hua, p. 342.

317. Quoted words from T. S. Eliot, On Poetry and Poets, p. 8.

318. A. J. Arberry (ed.), The Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám, p. 4.

319. Quotations from CW, II, pp. 87, 79, 146.

320. Chu Hsiang, Wen I-to and Jao Meng-k'an all treated colloquial poems as a special genre and used the term t'u-pai shih (土白詩) in Chinese; see Chu, "P'ing Hsü chün Chih-mo ti shih ", p. 7; Wen, "Shih ti ke-lü"; Jao, "Hsin shih-hua".

321. This is a feature of Hsiao-shuo yüeh-pao (小說月報) (Short Story Monthly).

322. See this chapter, pp. 131 f.

323. This is a slogan by the left-wing writers; see CW, V, p. 427.

324. See Hu Shih, Pai-hua wen-hsüeh shih, pp. 315 f.

325. The original title is "Hu Hang tao chung" (滬杭道中) (On the Way between Shanghai and Hangchow); see Hsiao-shuo yüeh-pao, XIV:11, 1923, p. 4.

326. A detailed account of Hsü's duplication can be seen in P'ei P'u-hsien, Shih tz'u ch'ü tieh-chü hsin-shang yen-chiu, pp. 127-149.

327. For Yü P'ing-po's defects see criticism by Wen I-to in Chu Tzu-ch'ing et al (ed.), op. cit. Ting chi (丁集), p. 160.

328. See chapter 1, note No. 81.

329. Rabindranath Tagore, Fruit Gathering, p. 25.

330. Ibid.

331. In the case of Lu Hsiao-man, the statement here does not apply to the time after 1924, for Hsü succeeded in winning her by the end of 1925.

332. For the little objects in Tagore and their significance see his Gitanjali, poem Nos. 1, 6; Stray Birds, poem Nos. 65, 67, 77, 101, 117, 134, 151, 178, 300, 307.

CHAPTER THREE

A. The "sentimental journey".

China was a disgusting place to Hsü Chih-mo shortly after Tagore completed his Far East tour in the summer of 1924. The civil war that flared up in September and the power struggle which never ceased between the warlords in and outside Peking shattered the peace of his mind.(1) On the other hand, his private life was practically a "civil war" within himself. In the last chapter we have seen how he had to leave Peking in March the next year because of his affair with Lu Hsiao-man, but there was another reason for his European journey. As a matter of fact, even if there had not been the scandalous romance, he would have gone all the same because he had promised to meet Tagore in Europe that spring.(2)

In Hsü's own words, his going abroad again was mainly for "complete my education".(3) His programme was this: touring Europe with Tagore and paying homage to Romain Rolland, Gabriele d'Annunzio and Thomas Hardy.(4) However, Tagore after a very brief stay in Italy, left for home even before Hsü set out on his journey.(5) As to the other "heroes", Hsü had a chance only with Thomas Hardy. But as d'Annunzio had a place in Hsü's life, it suits the order of this paper to discuss Hsü's "sentimental journey" in connection with him first.(6)

1. Gabriele d'Annunzio.

Hsü Chih-mo first read d'Annunzio while he was still a student at Cambridge. The Dead City impressed him to such a degree that he praised it as "an unmatched masterpiece".(7)

His admiration for d'Annunzio was probably the mainspring for his fairly long stay in Florence where he took up lodgings in the hills. During that period he was undoubtedly desirous of interviewing the Italian literary lion who was living in an adjacent area and had plenty of leisure in his mansion. The reason why Hsü failed to see the "hero" was apparently the latter's refusal to grant him the privilege.(8) Although unable to have his hero-worship sentiment gratified, Hsü seemed to admire d'Annunzio even more fervently, and eulogized him with a great many words most of which were borrowed from C. H. Herford.(9)

In his habitual way of exaggeration, Hsü proclaimed that in d'Annunzio one could see the combination of all the merits of Dostoievsky, Flaubert, Conrad, Pater and Gautier in terms of literary technique. He crowned his hero with the title of "a good son of Dante". Hsü appreciated d'Annunzio's ability for sensuous imagery, especially that associated with night; and this accounts for his translation of a night scene in Il Trionfo della Morte (The Triumph of Death) and also the nightingale's song in L'Innocente (The Victim).(10) Being the first to translate d'Annunzio into Chinese, Hsü was probably also the only one who could do full justice to the variety and gorgeousness of d'Annunzio's visual, auditory and olfactory images. They, as an influence, can be seen in a number of essays written by Hsü after his Florentine experience,(11) and are to a great extent instrumental in establishing him as one of the foremost mei-wen chia (美文家) (experts in belles-lettres) in modern Chinese literature.

The title of one of Hsü's short stories, Szu ch'eng (死城) (The Dead City), is obviously a borrowing from d'Annunzio's play mentioned above. Although the

content of Hsü's story is entirely different from d'Annunzio's play, the sharp contrast in its colour imagery is analogous to some passages in the Italian master's novels.

Yü Shang-yüan (余上沅) noted the Italian element in Hsü's only dramatic work Pien K'un-kang (卞昆岡).(12) Indeed, it does remind us of the various aspects of The Dead City: love, death, passion, hatred, cruelty, etc., all "trade-marks" of d'Annunzio.

As was in the case with Liang Ch'i-ch'ao's literary style, Hsü was also inadvertently affected by d'Annunzio's verbiage and "mania for adjectives". The epithet "nung te hua pu k'ai" (濃得化不開) (too concentrated to be diluted) which is used by many Chinese writers to describe Hsü's written style suits admirably Hsü's essays composed in or shortly after he left Italy, though it is not applicable in all cases.(13) It is Hsü's method to poetize his essays by manipulating sensuous imagery, and in this respect d'Annunzio's influence on him seems even stronger than Tagore's. On the other hand, the morbid motif of love-dath in d'Annunzio had a harmful effect more on Hsü's life than on his works. He might have been a Romeo if Lu Hsiao-man had been resolute enough to play the role of Juliet in the realization of love in death.(14)

What attracted Hsü to d'Annunzio was not only the latter's literary works in general and the passionate and extreme idiosyncracies of many of d'Annunzio's characters but also the Italian master's personality. D'Annunzio, poet, novelist, dramatist, aviator, patriot, politician, soldier, "great lover" and man-of-fashion, fulfilled Hsü's highest standard of man - the Renaissance man of many-sidedness.(15) Perhaps it would not be too far from the truth to say that Hsü must have secretly wished

to become a sort of Chinese d'Annunzio, or Superman whose creator Nietzsche was inspiration to both the Italian master and the Chinese disciple.

Hsü Chih-mo had little to say about d'Annunzio's poetry, obviously because he could not read Italian and d'Annunzio was known primarily by his novels and plays outside his country. Actually there were very few English translations of his poems in the 1920's.

In terms of politics Hsü was not sympathetic towards d'Annunzio's italianità (Italian national spirit). A champion for democracy, Hsü could hardly approve the ideas of a "John the Baptist of Fascism". However, his criticism of d'Annunzio was very mild.(16) When he was writing about him, he treated him primarily as a man of letters.

From Hsü's essays on d'Annunzio one would legitimately expect to see Hsü launch some scheme of translation of the versatile Italian writer in or after 1925. But somehow Hsü's enthusiasm seemed to flag after losing touch with the Florentine environment. Two reasons have been offered:

> (a) Hsü's ignorance of the Italian language may have dampened his zeal; for any further work he would do must depend on English translations. Although such an indirect rendering was not uncommon in China in the 1910's, a decade later this practice was regarded more and more with suspicion and even contempt. (b) Since his second marriage with Lu Hsiao-man in 1926, Hsü's sentiments became increasingly akin to those of Tagore and Hardy. And d'Annunzio's joie de vivre and sovrumenita would be rather boring.(17)

And indeed, none of his writings on d'Annunzio was included in any of his collections.

D'Annunzio's influence on Hsü was strong only in the years 1925 and 1926. After that, the pursuit of beauty, though by no means abandoned, slowed down; and the groping for light in the realm of philosophy, or religion, intensified in Hsü's life. In such a context, d'Annunzio inevitably became somewhat irrelevant. The subsequent years with family problems, straitened circumstances and even individual demoralization weighed down heavily on Hsü, and the joy and exhilaration he once savoured in d'Annunzio changed into pain. To return to the Italian then was entirely out of the question.

2. Thomas Hardy.

After Italy Hsü moved on to France and then England where, provided with a letter of introduction by Dickinson, he paid a visit to Thomas Hardy.(18) This interview to Hsü was as memorable as the one he had with Katherine Mansfield.(19)

Hardy must have arrested Hsü's attention as early as 1922. It is noteworthy that in the Heretics' Club in Cambridge, Hardy was adored as the "Poet of Heresy".(20) In Hsü's early translations, there were three poems by Hardy.(21)

Hardy's Late Lyrics and Earlier was published in May, 1922 and most probably Hsü bought a copy of it in England and brought it back to China later that year.(22) The possible influence of Hardy's "Apology" on Hsü's English style has already been pointed out earlier,(23) but his influence far exceeded this. First of all, we shall examine Hsü's opinion concerning Hardy's outlook on life.

When Hsü first mentioned Hardy in his "lectures" given at Nankai College in 1923, he simply called him "a pessimistic man".(24) After half a year or so, he endorsed the English poet's self-defence in the "Apology" of Late Lyrics and Earlier and argued that Hardy's was not pessimism but the "questionings of a genuine explorer of life" and what Hardy did was "courageously and undauntedly performing the duty of a poet and thinker".(25) In 1926, having read Hardy's seventh collection of poems Human Shows, Far Phantasies, Songs,and Trifles (1925), Hsü wrote an essay "Yen-shih ti Ha T'i" (厭世的哈提) (The Pessimistic Hardy) and dubbed Hardy "a pessimistic prophet".(26) Lastly, on Hardy's death in 1928, he wrote a poem and another essay. In the former he started with: "Hardy, pessimistic and weary of life ...",(27) but in the latter he more or less reiterated what he said in 1924:

> Hardy is not an arbitrary pessimist ... His realism, and his so-called pessimism are actually the sincerity and courage of his thought.(28)

Evidently Hsü was rather inconsistent. He seemed to be swaying between the common opinion and Hardy's own defence which was a vigorous refutation of the criticism heaped on him in the twenties. But judging from Hsü's writings on the English poet as a whole, it is clear that he was inclined to regard Hardy's outlook on life as "the obstinate questionings" (as Hardy himself called it) rather than pessimism (as many critics understood it). And indeed Hsü followed in Hardy's footsteps, trying hard to probe into the mysteries of life. He in his early thirties was anxious to do what Hardy did in his old age, and queries relating to life, death, this world, the other world, etc.

frequently arose in his writings especially after 1924.

Moreover, Hsü in his experiments with stanza forms proved himself Hardy's counterpart in modern China. He praised the English poet for the latter's "stanzaic variation", and his belief in Hardy's "success" may have been a source of inspiration to his own verse-making.(29)

Hsü's debt to Hardy certainly went beyond poetic forms. The Chinese disciple learned from the English master "the little ironies" in human life and above all "a true philosophy of life [that] seems to lie in humbly recording diverse readings of its phenomena as they are forced upon us by chance and change".(30) Liang Shih-Ch'iu hit the nail on the head when he pointed out Hsü's success in appropriating the shen-yün (神韻) (spirit, soul, essence, etc.) in Hardy's lyrics.(31)

The use of dialogue for the description of an incident is another Hardyan feature often found in Hsü. Being an animating conversationalist and well-versed in the Peking dialect,(32) Hsü enriched the pai-hua poetry by a familiar style which is especially remarkable in his social verse.

In terms of imagery, the grave, the graveyard, the deceased and the railway train in Hsü are reminiscent of Hardy. As to the latter's occasional archaism, Hsü's wen-yen element is something analogous to it though it would go too far to affirm that Hsü's use of some wen-yen expressions is in any direct way associated with Hardy's archaism.

Hsü Chih-mo wrote more on Hardy than on other western poets and his admiration for him was great and beyond doubt. In view of this, and of both the form and content in his poetry, perhaps we can be positive that Hardy's influence on him on the whole is greater than any other poet's.(33)

A few words may be added here about the translation of Hardy's lyrics by Hsü. Altogether he rendered thirteen or fourteen pieces.(34) The several done about the year 1923(35) are virtually a performance of self expression, or in Chinese, chieh t'a-jen chiu-pei chiao tzu-chi k'uai-lei (借他人酒杯澆自己塊壘) (expressing one's own mental burden by means of another person's works; literally: using another person's wine-cup to sprinkle [wine] on one's own pile of clods). Lin Hui-yin's image and Hsü's own sorrow caused by failure in love obviously lie behind his choice. As to the later translations, they by and large deal with life and death -typical Hardyism.

Hsü's translations of Hardy by far exceed those of other western poets. His devotion to the "Poet of Heresy" is unquestionable. But how good are his translated works? To answer this we must first point out that even a casual reading will reveal that Hsü is indeed capable of catching and conveying the Hardyan spirit particularly in the later pieces where the dialogue is usually everyday speech, familiar, unpretentious and yet meaningful. But perhaps Hsü is too much occupied with the "spirit" to be faithful to the original; and therefore he often has to add as much as to axe. For example, "Tui yüeh" (對月) (To the Moon) and "I ko hsing-ch'i" (一個星期) (A Week) are typically both good and not-too-accurate. In principle and technique, Hsü can be regarded as in agreement with FitzGerald whose free rendering of Omar Khayyám is more than readable translation.(36) Besides, Hsü evidently pays a great deal of attention to musical effect in his translation not only of Hardy but of other poets. The latter we can only afford to mention in passing since Hsü did not do many of them.

B. The period of the "Supplement to the Peking Morning Post".

1. The assumption of the editorship.

Lu Hsün' mention of Hsü Chih-mo's keenness in making contributions to different magazines was especially true in the first one or two years after his return from England.(37) When Chang Chün-mai and others were planning to run a monthly by the end of 1923, Hsü immediately pledged his support; but the enterprise somehow misfired.(38) Nevertheless, later in February, 1924, Hsü wrote to Authur Waley rather confidently about a project of his soon to be launched in Peking, saying:

> We are just planning to start a new weekly, very much in the nature of (the) London Nation, although we conceive of no definite principles, political or otherwise, to say things upon. ... we are quite vain enough to christen it as "The Ideal", whose appearance (April at latest) will probably set most people to sneer and some to anger, which we shall not grudge to bear.(39)

It seems that the project Chang Chün-mai had failed to realize was taken over by Hsü, who must have thought that by his ardour and devotion the "Ideal" could be created for the publication of his and his associates' "ideals". But again it was nothing but a fiasco.

After the establishment of the Crescent Moon Society, Hsü was obsessed with the idea of bringing out a Crescent Moon weekly or monthly,(40) and in the winter of 1924, acting on the suggestion of Tagore, he hoped

> ... to run a periodical (say a quarterly) in English, so that there could be direct communication between the new China with all her inspirations and aspirations on the one hand, and the rest of the intellectual world on the other.(41)

All these plans turned out to be bubbles. Then he was invited to succeed Sun Fu-yüan (孫伏園) who resigned the editorship of the Supplement to the Peking Morning Post. He declined, being too much occupied with his love affair perhaps. When his "sentimental journey" was over and he was back in Peking again, the board of management of the Morning Post, all his friends of the Crescent Moon Society, urged him to join them.(42) This time he accepted the offer, having been assured of the "absolute freedom of speech" he could enjoy as editor of the Supplement.(43)

Being financially secure, Hsü would not have taken over the editorship for the pay. One reason that induced him to embark on journalism might have been his love affair which by that time (September, 1925) had developed to such a stage that Lu Hsiao-man's personal decision was everything. There was nothing Hsü could do as long as his sweetheart was vacillating between filial piety and love and could not screw up enough courage to divorce her husband.(44) Suspense could better be endured in a busy life. Hsü must have been aware of that. But a more decisive reason was Hsü's own conviction of his "mission" in life. After all, a man like him did need a forum or in his words "a trumpet"(45) by which he could make his voice readily heard. Obviously he would have felt this keenly after the unpleasant experience with the people of the Creation Society and the Small Talks magazine.

He did not hide his purpose from the public; rather, he proclaimed it as soon as he assumed the editorship. In his first "manifesto" he said:

> I don't think I am a speculative editor. I will not cater for the public taste. I will not echo slavishly the words of the leaders of public opinion. I will not speak in favour of social stupidity and superficiality. I've come; I know only myself and am responsible to myself. What I don't want to say will not be said even if you press me or implore me. What I do want to say will be said even if you press me or implore me not to say it. I've come as editor with full authority.(46)

And further:

> Unlike my sensible and sophisticated predecessors who kept quiet whenever possible, I will most probably say things, and I'm afraid I'll often open my mouth.(47)

In the next issue of the Supplement, his second "manifesto" blared out more "big words". He "introduced", "interpreted", and "encouraged" himself in front of his audience. He called himself a "genuine idealist", "a believer in life" who had experienced "failure", "frustration" and "pain" but never gave up hopes and strife because he had a "fundamental belief, an impeccable one".(48)

As to his objective in running the Supplement, he made it clear that he was highly disgusted with the "phenomenon of withering away witnessed in the Chinese thinkers"(49) and therefore his main task was to challenge this phenomenon. Believing that he was no longer living in an ivory tower as he did before, he trumpeted his message:

> Yes, from now on I am determined to go forward. The first message of life is activity; the second is strife; the third is decision. Thought moves along the same line; the continuation of activity is combat.(50)

But his ambition was not entirely manifested at the inception of his renovation of the Supplement, and was made known only after a few months when he, having tasted a little inner frustration, wrote in retrospect:

> When I first came to edit the Supplement, I had a wish. I wanted to commit my whole self to those readers who would accept me. What I meant by readers, frankly speaking, was the young people of this age ... I desired to discover their sentiments in my own sentiments, and reflect their thought in my own thought.(51)

The above quotations are sufficiently illustrative of the aspirations of the new editor of the Supplement; but unfortunately, Hsü seemed to be unaware of the psychological distance between himself and his readers, i.e., the young people, and therefore his ambition to discover their sentiments and reflect their thought by a meditative approach which was a perpetual looking inward or, in his own terms, "a self anatomy", was doomed at the beginning. He could only make himself a lone prophet preaching in wilderness, but he could not make himself accepted by the young men and young women who were generally strongly influenced by the leftist trend of thought, and would find idealism, especially that kind of spiritualized idealism advocated by Hsü, distasteful and futile, and even reactionary and wicked.

In his zeal to carry out the programme of "examination", "investigation", "elimination", "testing", "challenging" and "demolishing"(52) in the field of

ideology, he inevitably came to face the most formidable adversary in China - communism.

2. The anti-communism discussion.

The anti-communism discussion, as it was known afterwards, started with an essay by Ch'en Ch'i-hsiu (陳啟修)[53]. Ch'en spoke from a "scientific" point of view in defence of Soviet Russia. Hsü's friend Chang Hsi-jo (張奚若) found Ch'en's writing vicious, and contributed an article to Hsü's Supplement to contradict it.[54] Russia was a burning issue at that time and quite a number of people following Ch'en and Chang made contributions to the Supplement to express their views.

As editor, Hsü did not openly take sides but stressed the dignity of independent thought. He asked all contributors to be sincere and rational in their arguments whether they were for or against Russia and communism.[55] However, in his comments and selection of articles, it was obvious that he supported the anti-communists simply because the activities of the communists and pro-communists in China in his eyes were often associated with fanaticism, irrationalism, cruelty, jealousy, threat, libel, ignorance, stupidity, etc. In order to press his point home obliquely, he translated a short story by Yoi Maraini and wrote an article as a postscript in which he condemned the communist activity in Kwangtung (廣東) province in particular.[56]

The discussion lasted about a month and in the end Russia and communism were more or less exposed as devils to the Chinese public. In one of his comments he said:

> The present issue, in the narrow sense, concerns the diplomatic relations between China and Russia, but in the broad sense, it concerns the destiny of China.(57)

These words have a prophetic flavour. He was fully conscious of the formidableness of Russia and communism.

He must have felt somewhat restrained in the progress of the discussion since in his capacity he had to maintain impartiality albeit he did have a great deal to say against Russia. In order to express himself freely, this being his principle, he took up the anti-communist topic again on a personal basis early in 1926 after the discussion had subsided. He seized an opportunity to criticize Marx, Lenin and communism on receipt of a mimeographed article entitled "Chi-nien Lieh Ning" (紀念列寧) (In Memory of Lenin) which was sent to him by its author Ch'en I (陳毅).(58) Hsü argued against Marx's theory of class struggle, especially its application to China. He did not believe in the proletarian revolution. He acknowledged the greatness of Lenin(59) but, he warned: "He is a fanatic. He will not admit that his thought will ever go wrong. Iron are his hands, and his heart is iron, too." (60) Being confident of his own judgement, which was strengthened by the experience of his personal visit to Russia a year before, he admonished the Chinese youth:

> Young people, don't praise the Russian revolution without giving some thought to it first. Be sure to know that that revolution is the hardest and the most agonizing event in human history.(61)

A few weeks later, he published two letters concerning how Chinese students were tortured in Russia

and how one of them suffered a complete mental breakdown.(62)

Moreover, when Hu Shih in his European tour sent him long letters commending Russia, particularly her educational system,(63) Hsü reacted quickly and sharply, and stigmatized Russia's education as nothing but "the education of isms" and "indoctrination". He made some shrewd remarks:

> They reject religion unconditionally; perhaps that is something good, but they substitute Marx and Lenin for Jesus, Das Kapital and the like for the Scriptures, and the dogmas of class struggle and historical materialism for creeds.(64)

In his comments Hsü revealed his undying admiration for the British type of democracy.

A few days later a Chang Hsiang-ting (張象鼎) wrote to the Supplement contradicting Hsü's words on the education of indoctrination conducted by a political party. In his reply, Hsü compared communism to Christianity in the Mediaeval age, censuring its extreme intolerance. He considered communism a religion of the worst form, one that allows people no choice but forces them to obey and persecutes those who dissent. Finally, refuting Chang's affirmative view on the efficiency in one party's dictatorship, he wrote:

> Even if we concede that one party's dictatorship, particularly a certain class's dictatorship, is indeed the most efficient way to reform society, I am afraid that no other work is more bloody than opening up such a way.(65)

Originally trained in political science, Hsü formed his conclusion on Russia long before he visited the

communist motherland in 1925. While he was still in England, he already wrote articles discrediting the communist system.(66) After his return to China, all the political happenings in the country only served to convince him that Russia and the kind of communism she cherished and introduced to China was the very evil man should combat. His random travel notes on Russia were heavily coloured with his anti-communist preoccupation, as could be expected.(67) But it would be wrong to suppose as many people do that he was therefore a protagonist of the capitalist system. This in fact he detested. There is no need to include long quotations from his writings. All his basic ideas about Russia and communism and capitalism can be discovered in The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism which Russell wrote after a visit to Russia in 1920. This volume must have been the fountain-head of inspiration and instruction to him in relation to Russia and other relevant questions.(68) On the constructive side, the following words by Russell are exactly what Hsü longed for:

> Good relations between individuals, freedom from hatred and violence and oppression, general diffusion of education, leisure rationally employed, the progress of art and science - these seem to me among the most important ends that a political theory ought to have in view.(69)

3. Some aspects of his thought expressed in prose.

1925 and 1926 were the most productive years of Hsü as a writer. In addition to the articles which were

born of the anti-communist discussion, he wrote other essays most of which were published in the Supplement. He often talked about "ideal" or "idealism" which was equated with "belief" or "simple belief" and its connotation of courage and strength in a subtle religious sense. But he did not expressly delineate his "ideal" and the reader would search in vain unless he reads his diary and letters addressed to Lu Hsiao-man.(70)

Hu Shih writing in memory of Hsü thus observed:

> His [Hsü's] philosophy of life is really a "simple belief" in which there are only three words: ... love ... freedom ... and beauty. He dreamed that these three ideal conditions could merge in a man's life.(71)

Liang Shih-ch'iu, however, preferred a modified form of Hu's observations. He said:

> Chih-mo's 'simple belief', I think, is not three ideals of 'love, freedom and beauty' respectively but one ideal which is the combination of the three elements of 'love, freedom and beauty', and ... let us shed all varnish and taboos, the reality of his ideal is the free union with a beautiful woman he loves.(72)

Evidently truth lay more with Liang than with Hu who, because of his intimate relations with Hsü, always speaks in defence of his friend. However, there is still another vital part in Hsü's ideal, and its failure almost completely wrecks his life as a man of letters. It is discussed in the next chapter and here we shall leave it for a while.(73)

As was noted previously, Hsü started preaching his gospel of art and life soon after his return to China

in 1922.[74] He believed with the members of the Creation Society in those days in art for art's sake. He continued to dwell on this topic till he became the editor of the Supplement. In September, 1926, his pronouncement marked a change of view:

> For a time I believed that life was life and art was art; art could always make use of the materials provided by life but life could not invade the territory of art, which was supposed to be forever independent and self-contained. Now I know art cannot be independent of life; its existence and development are based on some definite conditions. If life does not permit, art has no opportunity to stand on its own feet. A relatively peaceful life is the most basic premise for the birth of art. A chaotic age and culture are incompatible.[75]

Apart from this, another noticeable change was his attitude towards religion. He never believed in a personal god and was like most Chinese intellectuals definitely opposed to the kind of Christianity, Catholic or Protestant, preached by many western missionaries who were zealous about saving the Chinese "heathens" but simultaneously treated them openly or otherwise with a considerable amount of disgust and contempt.[76]

Armed with all the "heresy" of the Heretics' Club of Cambridge, Hsü was a "lost soul" when he returned to China in 1922. But he was more an agnostic than an atheist, and his was not an indiscriminate antagonism to Christianity. He had a fairly good knowledge of and great respect for the Bible although the latter did not spring from a believing heart. Early in 1924, he already proclaimed that "in the highest state, religion, philosophy, literature and art know no difference" [77] and after that,

he became keener and keener on the meaning of life and death. His frequent visits to graveyards and Buddhist resorts, his pantheistic devotion, his interest in Christmas carols, his idea of metamorphosis, etc.(78) All revealed a mental trend veering slowly but steadily towards religion, i.e., religion in the broadest sense. His sentiment in this respect is comparable to Shelley's.

The force that attracted Hsü to the spiritual realm may have come from several directions. Tagore, as mentioned before, was admittedly an influence, and then Shelley's pantheism, Pater's contemplative approach to life, Hardy's perpetual questionings of life and death, Liang Ch'i-ch'ao's Buddhism, the death of members of his family, relatives and friends,(79) his personal frustration in love ... all seemed to be relevant. Unfortunately, he died too young to complete his spiritual pilgrimage.

It is possible that Hsü's interest in the mysterious aspects of life to some extent kept him away from literary criticism which in his understanding was somewhat "scientific". Strictly speaking Hsü was not a literary critic, and he never considered himself as such; but as a writer himself, he did say something concerning the study of literature and art. He disparaged analysis of poetry, maintaining that "Poetry is one of the fundamental phenomena between heaven and man just like beauty and love; it is not to be analyzed."(80) What he meant by these words, as far as the context goes, was that poetry should be the product of inspiration, which was supposed to be a kind of heavenly revelation coming and going by its own inscrutable free will, rather than at the bidding of human knowledge or supplication. Later he quoted Sir Philip Sidney, obviously still bearing

the supreme position of inspiration in mind: "Poetry is the record of the best happiest moments of the happiest and best minds."(81) As to art, he expressed the similar view:

> To appreciate art and to enjoy mountain scenery follow the same principle. Provided that you occupy the right position, you absorb the whole spirit at a glance ... To approach art by analysis is a somewhat detrimental business. The holistic method is the right thing.(82)

Elsewhere he also stressed that the "impression" one obtained was the very value of art. He ridiculed all comparative studies of academic subjects. His approach to literature and art, in short, was impressionistic; small wonder Walter Pater and Anatole France were adored by him. What might be called literary criticism in Hsü, if any, is therefore "a poet's rather than a scholar's criticism".(83)

Hsü in his essays had a great deal to say about his likes and dislikes which all stemmed from his extreme individualism. Being obsessed in it, he was sometimes unable to consider questions from a broader point of view. For instance, though he attempted to delve into the political and social problems in China, he did not comprehend the needs of the majority of the Chinese people, i.e., the peasants in the hinterland whose most immediate concern was to have enough food to eat and enough clothes to wear. Later in 1929, after some personal suffering and hardship, Hsü seemed to have widened his perspective and talked about "our people eighty to ninety percent of whom are peasants".(84) But surprisingly, his conclusion was, in addition to an

emphasis on education (that is sensible enough), "promotion of marriage between classes".(85) He elaborated thus:

> Comparatively speaking ... country people are much healthier than city people. It follows that ... city people should marry country people to the greatest extent possible.(86)

Further:

> If the state were empowered to interfere in marriage, we could resort to compulsion: having you gallant [city] young men marry the country girls and having our pretty, flirting [city] maidens marry the peasants.(87)

Such statements, with all their eugenic overtones, might have been promoted by his own experience of life after 1927 when his second wife Lu Hsiao-man was often unwell and yet indulged in an extravagant life with fashionable people.(88) Referring to a better future, he said:

> In the days of the realization of our ideal (if our culture is not completely doomed), the young men and young women of the future will definitely and concurrently possess the characteristics of the intellectuals and the peasants - a balanced development of physical strength and intellectual power.(89)

Curiously, that is exactly the policy pursued in today's China whose political system would have been abhorrent to Hsü.

If some of these ideas seem unrealistic, Hsü is not unaware of his own inadequacy; his comments on himself

are quite appropriate:

> You know very well that I am a poet, whose personal effects are at most an earnest, warm heart in addition to a few castles that exist in the air.(90)

4. Lu Hsün again.

The first article written by Hsü on the assumption of editorship of the Supplement to the Peking Morning Post carried an interesting account about how he was made the editor; part of it reads:

> Some people ... were not only against my taking up the job but against the presence of all newspaper supplements ... That night Ch'en T'ung-po [Ch'en Yüan] was also among us ... He said he did not like me to work as a supplement editor either, since he also hated newspaper supplements; but in order to have them all 'executed' ... he took a different view, saying that he would support my running the Supplement to the Peking Morning Post [with two objectives in mind] : first, killing the supplements of other newspapers; secondly, strangling my own supplement. Then [he said] mankind would be forever free from the plague of supplements. His words were witty, but they conveyed too great a compliment to me.(91)

Such frank remarks, smacking of some innocent pride and analogous in tone to those in the prologue to his translated poem of Baudelaire,(92) did not escape and did not fail to disgust Lu Hsün, an old enemy.(93)

A few months later Lu Hsün, Chou Tso-jen and Ch'en Yüan were engaged in a "pen-war"; Hsü published in his Supplement letters by both Chou and Ch'en, he

himself hoping to be a peace-maker.(94) Unfortunately, he was too eager to play this part to realize his own feelings, for emotionally he was on his friend's side and was obviously nourishing a grudge against Lu Hsün. When the "battle" was raging, Hsü made the following announcement:

> To speak quite frankly, Hsi-ying [Ch'en Yüan] is my friend, one of those I most admire and respect. His scholarship and character are both unquestionable ... As to Mr. Lu Hsün, actually I have never known what he looks like ... It may sound highly disrespectful on my part, but I have read very little of him ... As to those odds and ends he usually produces, even if I should try to read them, the effort would be made in vain, for I simply couldn't concentrate my attention on them or grasp their meaning.(95)

Nonchalantly resorting to paradox, Hsü praised his friend Ch'en Yüan and simultaneously taunted Lu Hsün, saying:

> Hsi-ying is a fool; he vainly hopes to administer justice and to hold up the standard of common sense in his causeries ... [You, i.e., Ch'en Yüan] fed the cat with the essence of ginseng; she didn't appreciate your kindness but awarded you with her paws.(96)

All these words had their sting. Hsü coolly and calmly dismissed Lu Hsün's character, scholarship and literary works, leaving out on purpose Lu Hsün's Chung-kuo hsiao-shuo shih lüeh (中國小說史略) (An Outline History of Chinese Fiction) which he had read appreciatively and recommended to Arthur Waley less than two years before.(97)

Hsü's hint at the worthlessness of Lu Hsün's miscellaneous essays was quite understandable, and Lu Hsün's reaction was predictable; he declared that Hsü and Ch'en Yüan were "collaborating to trample" him.(98) In addition, he slighted Hsü's Supplement as "a trifling publication" the reading of which was well below his dignity.(99) Actually both Hsü and Lu Hsün were only too eager to read each other's writings so as to know the enemy.

All in all, Lu Hsün must have taken to heart Hsü's cold sneer towards his writings, for indeed, what could hurt a man of letters more deeply than an affirmation of the triviality of his literary products? Ch'en Yüan was admittedly an enemy of Lu Hsün, but even he paid some compliments to the elder man's works.(100) Viewing this feud from this angle, it is easy to see why, as reported by Ch'en, Lu Hsün had at least once shaken hands with Ch'en but would not show the same courtesy to Hsü Chih-mo.(101)

Furthermore, there must have been many mannerisms of Hsü which Lu Hsün could not approve. In addition to his love poems, his familiar and sometimes ingratiating prose style, his association with the rich and the socially high-class dignitaries of the day, his activities in and outside the Crescent Moon Society, his English urbanity, American enthusiasm and perhsps also some French joie de livre ... all were anathema to Lu Hsün. No wonder Lu Hsün, who was reported to have declared "I forgive no one",(102) seized every chance to deride, condemn and rebuke Hsü directly or indirectly whenever he thought fit.(103) But Hsü did not like prolonged squabbles. To whatever Lu Hsün wrote of him, he responded with an aristocratic cold silence. However, he was no saint,

and his occasional sneering words against Lu Hsün could be found by careful persons acquainted with the moods of the "pen-wars" among modern Chinese writers.(104) Hsü was not always an innocent and harmless butterfly only fluttering among beauties as many people think him to be; indeed, he sometimes could be a honeybee, if not a wasp, and surely could sting.

Lu Hsün's general attack on Hsü was, in the final analysis, partly out of personal spite and partly out of political conviction. Just like many human motives, it was not all glowing nobility as invariably affirmed by the communists, nor was it all contemptible villainy as often branded by the anti-communists.(105)

5. Chou Tso-jen.

With Lu Hsün's brother Chou Tso-jen in the context of Hsü Chih-mo's life, we have a different story.

Although Chou was heavily involved in the "pen-war" just mentioned above, he and Hsü were not enemies. In a letter to Chou by the end of 1925, Hsü praised the famous essayist's literary works.(106) During the "warring period", Hsü continued to pay compliments to Chou.(107) Their friendship, though at most lukewarm, did not seem to have been impaired by the jangling and wrangling between Chou and Ch'en Yüan. And the friendship evidently progressed steadily till Hsü's death ended it.(108) Of all the Small Talks magazine people, Chou was the only one who wrote an essay in memory of Hsü.(109)

Both Hsü and Chou in literary creation believed

in individual expression. In criticism, both adhered to the impressionistic approach. In the important issue of the Chinese written language, they upheld Europeanization but simultaneously did not completely eliminate individual wen-yen expressions which to them meant virility and expressiveness rather than antiquity, traditionalism, feudalism and the like. Both abhorred standardization of thought and advocated tolerance in politics, religion and literature. Of course there were still other similarities between them such as the belief in individual "repentence" as the first step to national rejuvenization of China; the reverence for the Bible as a great literary work; the admiration for Edward Carpenter, etc.(110) Although their temperament, family and educational background, literary style, the general way of life were different, both gained more and more magnanimity in their intellectual development and the outcome was each being able to appreciate the other. In political terms, their relationship exemplifies the ideal co-existence which, in spite of divergencies, does not lead to unpleasant friction or cold wars. It is also a peaceful spot in the field of modern Chinese literature where too many "battles" have been fought and too much energy and talent wasted. The kind of "kindly feeling" fostered by them is what Russell considers one of the most essential prerequisites in the building of a happier world for mankind.(111)

6. The Poetry Magazine.

The Chinese pai-hua poetry since its birth in the literary revolution (1917) had been "free" in every

conceivable way till 1926 when the Poetry Magazine (Shih-k'an (詩刊) or Shih-chien (詩鐫) in Chinese) was published as part of the Supplement to the Peking Morning Post. This publication lasted only a little longer than two months but it exerted considerable influence.

Most people identify the Poetry Magazine chiefly with Hsü Chih-mo. While there is truth in such identification, the whole story is not so simple. Although the complexity is less bewildering than what is related to the term Hsin-yüeh (Crescent Moon), as discussed previously, there are still some incidents which have long been blurred. It is hoped that the present discussion will help to present a clearer picture of an important period in the progress of modern Chinese poetry.

With due respect to history it is more appropriate to focus our attention on Wen I-to first.

Wen I-to, like Hsü Chih-mo, admired Kuo Mo-jo in the beginning, and associated himself, to a certain extent at least, with the Creation Society.(112) But Wen was too brilliant and too proud a character to play the follower's role for long. An exceptionally energetic young man, he was enthusiastic about art, poetry, drama and politics while studying in America; and he was desirous of publishing a magazine to voice his and his associates' opinion on politics and to present themselves as patriots and men of letters to their countrymen.(113) Ta-chiang chi-k'an (大江季刊) (The Great River Quarterly) was the fruit of this zeal.(114)

Wen returned to China from America in summer, 1925. He got acquainted with Hsü Chih-mo in Peking and by his kind recommendation obtained an appointment at the National Academy of Fine Arts.(115) As a show of courtesy, Wen joined the Crescent Moon Society when invited by Hsü. However, a Bohemian artist himself, at least at that time, he just could not stand the high-class

airs of the Society and quitted it soon.(116) Another reason for his withdrawal might have been the consciousness of his own talents, hence the reluctance to submit himself to other people's leadership - a case comparable to Kuo Mo-jo's refusal to join the Literary Association.(117) Indeed, even before Wen went abroad for further studies, he was already an acknowledged "big brother" in the Literary Society of Tsing Hua College and wielded an influence on those around him.(118) Having quietly dispensed with the Crescent Moon Society, he attracted a number of poets to himself in no time in Peking. They regularly gathered in his house studying, reciting, and discussing poetry.(119) In a letter dated 23rd March, 1926, Wen told Liang Shih-ch'iu (who was still a student in America then) how he and his poet friends wanted to form a dining society and publish a literary magazine but, apparently embarrassed by limited financial resources, they were not confident enough to embark on their enterprise.(120) All this was a secret to Hsü Chih-mo who, however, finally heard about the "new poets' happy abode", and hurried to join them on 27th March, without having been invited.(121)

Hsü was impressed by Wen's fanciful and artistic studio and was even more profoundly impressed by the activities taking place in it. The outcome of Hsü's "membership" in this group was the publication of the Poetry Magazine which made its first appearance as part of the Supplement only four days later on the first day of April. The leading article by Hsü was the manifesto which carried the following declaration:

> Our big words are: we treat regulated new poetry as a serious task for us to perform ... We believe that in and around us there are

> many poetic souls in the sphere of thought that clamour for embodiment. Our responsibility is to create a suitable body for them -- that is the discovery of new forms and new rhythm for poetry and all sorts of art. We believe that a perfect form is the only expression of a perfect spirit; we believe that the life of literature and art is invisible inspiration plus conscious perseverance and hard work; lastly, we believe our new literature, just like our people, has a great and bright future.(122)

The Poetry Magazine altogether had eleven issues, containing about a hundred poems by over a dozen men. Many other people outside the Wen-Hsü group submitted contributions, but most of them were rejected.(123)

Hsü contributed in total sixteen poems, ranking the first as far as the number is concerned;(124) but he may not have written more words than Liu Meng-wei (劉夢葦) or Jao Meng-k'an (饒孟侃) who produced some longer pieces.

Most of the poems of the Poetry Magazine were lyrical, and the most striking feature was their ke-lü (regularity or form) embodied in stanza forms, rhythm and rhyme. The longer ones were ballads and dialectal verses, the latter genre being rather vigorously promoted. The Shakespearean sonnet form also made a shy debut in two poems, one in Chinese, and the other in English!(125)

It is true that the Poetry Magazine was intended to inaugurate a new movement in pai-hua poetry, supported not only by works but by theory. Of all the poets concerned, Wen I-to and Jao Meng-k'an emerged as theorizers; they wrote three major essays on the kind of poetry which, they thought, should instigate another revolution of the pai-hua verse.

The theory of the leader, Wen I-to, was well-known. He emphasized the paramount importance of ke-lü in poetry; his definition of this term was: "Ke-lü is form ... Ke-lü is rhythm." The former was supposed to be "visual" and the latter, "auditory".(126) He added more details:

> The ke-lü of the visual aspect comprises the evenness of stanzas and the uniformity of lines. The ke-lü of the auditory aspect comprises stanza form, rhythm groups, tone and rhyme.(127)

It seems strange that stanza forms should be categorized as something auditory. The explanation was offered by Jao Meng-k'an:

> Outwardly stanza form and rhythm seem to be two parallels in poetry and should be treated separately; actually stanza form is the most important element of rhythm which cannot be harmonious and uniform without a proper stanza form.(128)

Wen's summary of his and Jao's theory was that poetry should have "the beauty of music", "the beauty of painting" and "the beauty of architecture".(129)

As to Hsü Chih-mo, he did not pose as a theorizer, but he nevertheless presented his views at the close of the Poetry Magazine in June saying:

> The life of poetry lies in its internal rhythm ... Let's take a human being for comparison. The words and lines of a poem are the visible body. Rhythm is blood. Poetic inspiration, or the original poetic sentiment, is the beating of the heart, which makes the circulation of the blood possible.(130)

It is noteworthy that Hsü's opinion was not quite in line with Wen's theory. Wen's idea of ke-lü, as shown above, is all comprehensive, but Hsü seems to treat rhythm and ke-lü as two parallels in poetic technique, and that was what exactly Jao refuted.(131) Further, Hsü in 1923 when writing about verse-making extolled nothing but inspiration,(132) and now he still stressed this point; the only difference was that he substituted shih-kan (詩感) for ling-kan (靈感).(133) The former sounds a little more concrete than the latter, but in usage, they are more or less the same thing - inspiration.

Jao Meng-k'an slighted inspiration. He wrote:

> Rhythm is the most important element in poetry. [We should] also know that a good poem cannot be written upon the arrival of the so-called inspiration (which is in reality random thoughts).(134)

Wen I-to did not actually call inspiration "random thoughts" but evidently he too was convinced of the close ties between what is usually called "inspiration" and careless, hence inferior literary work, and he did scorn the romantic idea of self-expression.(135) Moreover, when writing in support of his theory about the beauty of architecture, he stressed that

> The uniformity of words and lines must be the inevitable phenomenon brought about by a harmonious rhythm. And an absolutely harmonious rhythm must require the uniformity of words and lines.
>
> .....
>
> In view of this, the uniformity of words is of tremendous importance; since from this outward form we can test the inner spirit of a poem - i.e., whether rhythm exists or not.(136)

Hsü Chih-mo, however, made the following observations:

> If anybody insists rigidly on the uniformity of the number of words and lines, I'll say he is wrong. Whether the individual lines should be longer or shorter and whether the number of words in each line should be uniform or otherwise, all depends on the movement of rhythm that you can rightly grasp.(137)

In spite of differences, Hsü was not intentionally refuting Wen I-to. He apparently took a more cautious approach, and when experimenting with a new method, he was wary of the possibility of abuse and demerit that often accompany extremity. And in fact these weaknesses were already seen in some versifiers by the end of the Poetry Magazine period;(138) this must have been the main reason for Hsü to call attention to the other side of the question and to speak seemingly negatively.

As an avant-garde movement, the Poetry Magazine had its unique place in the development of pai-hua poetry. Its rise was at a time when the first batch of experimental pai-hua poets like Hu Shih, Chou Tso-jen, Chu Tzu-ch'ing (朱自清), Yü P'ing-po, Liu Fu, K'ang Pai-ch'ing (康白情), et al had become indifferent to the Muses or had switched their interest to something else. Although there were quite a number of practising younger "poets", their products were mostly doggerel. During that period, "readable poems were very few" as Wang Yao (王瑤) commented.(139) The Poetry Magazine with its works and theory earnestly and exclusively devoted to a higher and more sophisticated level of poetry, at once made its influence felt. With regard to this the veteran poet Chu Tzu-ch'ing informed

Chinese readers:

> After the birth of our Poetry Magazine of the Peking Morning Post,[140] the general trend of creation turned to the regulated verse.[140]

He also added: "The regulated poetry movement has left a permanent influence."[141] But not all people hailed this new movement. Those who protested against it dubbed its products "dry bean-curd verse" or "square figure verse", alluding to its formalism; and some were worried that pai-hua poetry would be shackled again by the age-old wen-yen poetic tradition.[142] With the exception of some leftist critics who dismissed this movement as something western and bourgeois in essence and therefore worthless, most people acknowledged its achievement in checking the chaotic "free" situation in pai-hua poetry and in breeding an "attitude of seriousness and carefulness that is essential in verse-making".[143] The present-day poets in evaluating the movement usually stressed its being the pioneer that saved pai-hua poetry from its "shallow tones" which had reigned supreme since Hu Shih started his experiments.[144] But as to the strict ke-lü advocated by Wen I-to, few paid unreserved compliments.[145] The rigidity of the beauty of music, painting and architecture together with its inescapable result of a heavy "trochee" can not be realized in all pai-hua verse with equal success. Pai-hua poetry, with its variety and its relative closeness to the spoken language, must admit some freedom though not necessarily anarchy. In this respect Hsü had a healthier influence than Wen.[146] Even in his regulated works, he always managed to keep a degree of lightness,[147] or irregularity

that offset heaviness and monotony.

Wen I-to was a sort of modern Han Yü (韓愈); his brilliance, erudition and hard work make those wishing to excel him despair. His achievement is not for all to emulate or imitate.(148) It is always easier and more profitable for the average pupil to learn from Hsü Chih-mo. That partly explains why Hsü's fame is greater than Wen's though his poetical works may not better and longer stand the test of time than his friend's.

Although the Poetry Magazine flourished a relatively short time and Hsü Chih-mo tried to shun polemics whenever possible, some of his colleagues were not content with a solely constructive programme. They deemed it their duty to expose the unhealthy elements in modern Chinese poetry. Both Jao Meng-k'an and Chu Hsiang wrote articles criticizing poets of other schools and Wen I-to also took part in the criticism, though less directly.(149)

Another interesting thing was the political tendency shown in the Poetry Magazine, the first number of which, significantly, was designated as a "special issue" in connection with the March eighteenth incident and the poems and articles were imbued with indignation and condemnation against the Peking government.(150) Hsü Chih-mo's reaction to this particular event as manifested in the Magazine was comparatively mild. He produced only one short and highly symbolic poem.(151) Actually the special flavour of this "special issue" originated in Wen I-to who, a zealous nationalist then, was always a man with an extremely strong sense of justice.(152) The sweeping conclusion that the Poetry Magazine poets (or Crescent Moon poets as later understood by many people) were apolitical must be supplemented with this qualification.

It is true, however, that in a comparative sense the Poetry Magazine poets were less revolutionary than those who had accepted the Marxist outlook on life. The former group were after all mainly concerned with searching for new ways to lead pai-hua poetry to a higher ground and a future that might compare favourably with the glorious past of the defunct wen-yen poetry. Among them, the most distinguished two were admittedly Wen I-to and Hsü Chih-mo, followed by Jao Meng-k'an, Liu Meng-wei, Chu Hsiang, Sun Ta-yü (孫大雨), Yang Tzu-hui (楊子惠), Chu Ta-nan (朱大枏) and others. It may be noted in passing that Shen Ts'ung-wen (沈從文), later well-known for his stories and novels, was originally also one of the group.(153)

Of the Poetry Magazine poets, Chu Hsiang was more learned and talented than many others. He was in the beginning one of the four close "comrades" of Wen I-to.(154) But he started a one-man "coup d'état" a few weeks after the publication of the Poetry Magazine. Challenging the leadership of Wen, he declared that he would "dethrone the god of Jao [Meng-k'an], Yang [Tzu-hui] and others". He also made an enemy of Hsü Chih-mo, saying that Hsü's "protruding mouth already disqualifies him as a poet". Wen I-to, gravely upset, in a private letter to Liang Shih-ch'iu called Chu "a mad dog" and "a man with madness and animal instinct but without warm feelings".(155) At the close of the Magazine, Hsü using military terms figuratively wrote about this incident with much tact:

> Mr. Chu Hsiang ... should have been a great general and pioneer of our group, but unfortunately (it is both our misfortune and the readers'), he missed the muster mid-way and could not catch up. It was something deeply regrettable. But we still

> hope that in future when we start a new expedition, he will enlist voluntarily and fight the battle with us.(156)

Chu Hsiang was evidently a bad politician. In order to overthrow the "god of Jao and Yang and others", he should not have antagonized Hsü. In this storm in a teacup, Hsü's words, as quoted above, show their writer's magnanimity, and by this virtue he won many friends and ironed out many misunderstandings among literary people who, being endowed with finer sensibility coupled with some possible idiosyncracies, were sometimes more liable to dissonance and conflict than ordinary persons. When Hsü revived the Poetry Magazine in 1931, Chu Hsiang's name appeared before the readers again. And after Hsü's death, while Wen maintained a mysterious silence, Chu wrote a sonnet in memory of Hsü, with true sincerity and appreciation.(157)

7. Wen I-to.

Very often the name Poetry Magazine was linked with the name of Hsü Chih-mo and the poets contributing to the Magazine were called "Hsü's circle"(158) because Hsü declared the Magazine's birth and wrote the editorial essay in the first issue and another one in the last. Although he acknowledged the very great contribution made by Wen I-to, he wrote expressly to the effect that he, not Wen, was the editor.(159) However, Wen in a letter to Liang Shih-ch'iu clearly gave the impression that he was the editor of the Poetry Magazine; and as to the "four important members" of the Magazine he named, Hsü

was not among them.[160] The obvious contradiction would seem to be due to the informal inauguration of the publication. Hsü called himself the editor simply because the Poetry Magazine was a supplement to the Supplement of the Morning Post. Wen considered himself the editor of the Poetry Magazine because he was the leader of the group of poets who gave birth to this particular literary project. Since Wen was, to use Chu Hsiang's words, "the god" among the group who were originally all his "little brothers" or "disciples", it was more than probable that the final decision concerning the most vital part of the editorial work, namely the acceptance or rejection of contributions, rested with him rather than Hsü who, because of his position in the Morning Post, must have been in reality a kind of "business manager"; or in terms of politics in China whether then or now, Hsü was the president of the state while Wen was the secretary-general or chairman of the party in power. The one who actually wielded the sceptre was the latter despite most of the outward pomp being associated with the former.[161] In this connection it was no surprise that when Wen left Peking at the start of summer vacation, the time also came for the Poetry Magazine to have its "long leave".

But the relationship between Hsü and Wen does not end here, and it deserves more discussion. Evidence has it that from the beginning to the end, Hsü always had a high regard for and a great deal of warm feeling towards Wen who, subtly and yet noticeably cool, never proportionately reciprocated. As a matter of fact, Wen had no obvious reason to be resentful of Hsü in view of how Hsü befriended and respected him, and secured a job for him on his return to China; still Wen seemed to have found it hard to treat Hsü as a bosom friend as he did Liang Shih-ch'iu.

It is a well-known fact that the publication of the Crescent Moon Monthly in 1928 marked the second collaboration between Hsü and Wen, but there was not much enthusiasm displayed by the latter. Later in 1931 when Hsü revived the Poetry Magazine in Shanghai and pressed Wen (who then taught in Tsingtao) for contributions, Wen sent him only one poem. Of course this weak response may have been chiefly due to Wen's concentration on academic research and also loss of interest in creative writing, but there was no indication that he was in any way anxious to keep up cordial relations with Hsü. The strongest evidence of Wen's coolness towards Hsü in the later period was his absolute and almost unfriendly and ungrateful silence after Hsü's tragic death. When scores of people, friends or mere acquaintances, poured out verses or essays on that occasion, Wen, when asked, forced the following reply: "The whole life of Chih-mo consisted of romantic stories. What can I write about him?"(162) These words could hardly account for his strange attitude, for he knew quite well that Hsü's "whole life" did not merely "consist of romantic stories". Why could he not say something about his poetry and essays; or his warm personality; or his kindness in helping him and others; or his indefatigable zeal in cultural activities? What made Wen so grudging?

As is obvious in the above statement by Wen, he was not sympathetic towards Hsü's divorce and especially his subsequent wild romance. In the matter of marriage Wen was a strict traditionalist. While appreciative of the beauty and nobility of love between man and woman, he appreciated more deeply the nobility by which a man could kill passion at a stroke when responsibility and love clashed.(163) On account of his own experience Wen

must have found Hsü's love affairs rather vicious.

Secondly, Wen never even hinted that he ever thought highly of Hsü's writings, prose or poetry.(164) As already noted above, he did not consider Hsü an important member of the Poetry Magazine group and when Hsü sent him the manuscripts of Fei-leng-ts'ui ti i-yeh (翡冷翠的一夜) (A Night in Florence) for comments the next year, Wen, acting in every way a "big brother", or a Chinese lao fu-tzu (老夫子) (old teacher or pedant), wrote to Hsü thus: "This is definitely an advance on Chih-mo's Poems - a very big advance."(165) Here was an encouraging statement, but it did not amount to any positive commendation of the quality of the work and in light of Wen's general attitude of "no comment" towards Hsü's poetry, one is tempted to think that what had not been expressed in Wen's reply might have been (a) Chih-mo's Poems was rather poor in quality and (b) A Night in Florence was much better, but there was still much to be desired.

Evidently Wen as a poet, given to irregular verse for a short period, soon came to believe in poetic art rather than in the so-called "spontaneous flow"; in other words, he believed in the drudgery in the business of verse-making rather than in the fluttering poetic inspiration.(166) In view of this, Hsü in his eyes must have been more or less a dilettante.

Thirdly, Wen was essentially a scholar but Hsü was not. The fact that a man with little solid scholarship and yet by his family wealth, sociability, social connections and some natural talent rather than hard work had secured for himself success and fame would scarcely have elicited any great respect from a man like Wen I-to. Bearing this in mind, we may view Wen's

indifference to Hsü as symbolizing the contempt of the class of scholar-officials (Wen being from a scholar-official family) for the bourgeoisie (Hsü being from a merchant family).

Fourthly, the social circle of Hsü was on the whole repugnant to Wen who never enjoyed the company of bankers, politicians, frivolous fashionable ladies and the philistinism that was often a mark of these people. And indeed, even Hsü's academic and literary friends were not entirely acceptable to Wen - at least Hsü's good friend Hu Shih was Wen's "enemy" from the literary point of view.(167)

Fifthly, the Dionysian joy manifested in carousing, feasting, flaunting of talents, displaying of grandiloquent designs, etc. in Hsü's life was never congenial to Wen who, while believing in good food, believed in sharing it with his own family,(168) and he was more used to practical hard work than childish bragging. In spite of the warm personality of Hsü that nobody could deny and few could resist, Wen must have discerned in Hsü a frivolity which repelled him.

Sixthly, Hsü's habitual informal, or thoughtless in the bad sense, words or acts could not have completely pleased Wen. For instance, during the Poetry Magazine period, in addition to calling himself the sole editor, Hsü suggested that all the Poetry Magazine poets were mere learners serving their "apprenticeship".(169) His suggestion may have been interpreted as a denial of Wen's leadership and mastery. Then when the Crescent Moon Monthly was still in its embryonic stage, he christened it without first consulting Wen and others; and later when Ch'en Meng-chia came to edit The Anthology of the Crescent Moon Poetry, Hsü

obviously approved the title and the order and selection of the poems with the result that he himself headed the volume with eight poems and Wen came next with only six.(170) Such treatment could not but arouse Wen's suspicion of a sort of duplicity of Hsü who while acknowledging the influence of the author of Szu-shui (死水) (The Dead Water) on him and others in the preface of his third collection Meng hu chi (猛虎集) (The Tiger), shifted Wen to a second place in the anthology a month later.(171) Moreover, the name "Crescent Moon", which was ever dear to Hsü, did not seem to have appealed to Wen.(172) After all, the Indian writer he admired was Mrs. Naidu, not Tagore.(173)

Having examined all the possibilities enumerated above, we should not be too surprised at Wen's refusal to write or speak about Hsü after the latter's death. Being true to truth and to himself, and yet maintaining a traditional Chinese scholar's propriety towards one who once helped keep the wolf from his door, Wen could only choose to be silent. It is doubtful whether Hsü ever gauged accurately Wen's feelings towards himself.

8. The Drama Magazine.

After the close of the Poetry Magazine Hsü continued the avant-garde spirit of the Supplement of the Peking Morning Post by launching the Chü k'an (劇刊) (The Drama Magazine). Again, as editor of the Supplement, he wrote the introductory article, listing five objectives which the people of the Magazine aspired to achieve:

> The first: promulgation, which is to give society an idea of drama so as to arouse sympathy and attention ... The sedond: discussion. We don't confine ourselves to a particular school ... We think whatever is related to drama is worth discussing ... The third: criticism and introduction ... The fourth: research. This concerns the various techniques of drama ... At the same time we also invite contributions of plays... (174)

Above all, Hsü announced that he and his friends intended to set up a small theatre in the shortest time possible.

The Drama Magazine people were mainly Wen I-to's colleagues of the National Academy of Fine Arts and some other friends interested in drama, but most of them were not among those poets contributing to the Poetry Magazine. They were determined to interest the Chinese public and convince them of the fact that drama was an art, not a contemptible occupation practised only by low-class people. Their open discussion even included the traditional Chinese opera which many western-educated intellectuals slighted.

The Drama Magazine started on 17th June and ended on 23rd September, 1926, having altogether fifteen issues, and enjoying a little longer life than the Poetry Magazine.(175) Never before had such a comprehensive discussion of drama appeared in any Chinese newspaper. The reason for its close was the lack of support when most of the people concerned had to leave Peking for other places to earn their living after a couple of months or so of collaboration.(176) As to the five objectives, only the second and the third may be reckoned as having been moderately achieved. Their fond dream, the small theatre, remained a dream at the end of the Magazine.

With regard to the first objective, Yü Shang-yüan had some apt remarks:

> The Drama Magazine itself ... was not a fiasco, but our first hope - i.e., awaking society [to the importance of drama] - was a failure. Society did not want drama; how could you force them to accept it?(177)

Hsü Chih-mo was the man to sound the trumpet-call, but the role he played was almost negligible. He did not pretend to be a connoisseur in drama and said it:

> I am ashamed of myself for being no more than a small soldier who can only wave the banner in addition to some shouting. I know nothing about drama ... I am absolutely useless. But, friends, if you should know my zeal, my zeal ...(178)

Hsü as editor of the Supplement, wrote at the beginning and also at the end as he did for the Poetry Magazine. But apart from this and an article,(179) he did not contribute anything else to the Drama Magazine. With reference to his failure in doing his "assignment",(180) he explained thus: "... [it was] partly because I felt quite empty over this subject ... partly because I was just lazy."(181)

The idea of launching the Drama Magazine originally came from Chang Chia-chu (張嘉鑄), or Chang Yü-chiu (張禹九), one of Hsü's ex-brothers-in-law. The editor was Yü Shang-yüan.(182) Both Chang and Yü studied drama in America and they were bent on bolstering the Chinese drama movement with others including Wen I-to. This time Hsü did not call himself the, or an, editor; indeed, he did not even finish the closing

editorial article of the Drama Magazine which had to be completed by Yü Shang-yüan.(183)

In spite of his limited contribution to the Magazine, many people still attribute the inauguration and the success, if any, of the Magazine to him simply because as editor of the Supplement of the Morning Post, he was regarded as responsible for whatever enterprises associated with the Supplement. Of course this is not entirely untrue, but neither is it accurate.

Hsü was always glad to take whatever part he could to enhance the image of the Muses in China. His own words "my zeal, my zeal ..."(184) do represent the man; and they may be the most appropriate self-attribution to himself as far as the drama movement is concerned.

Hsü's role in both the Poetry Magazine and the Drama Magazine is more than often exaggerated by literary historians and other writers. Their impression of Hsü's importance is considerably strengthened by Hsü's lasting interest in poetry and literature and arts in general, and also by his colourful personality; as a result, other persons who should also share the limelight, like Wen I-to and Yü Shang-yüan for example, are eclipsed. None the less, Hsü did do a significant job for these two magazines and ultimately for the development of modern Chinese literature; for if he had not been the editor of the Supplement "with full authority" and "the absolute freedom of speech" who could make space available for the two magazines, modern Chinese literature would have been the poorer.

It is appropriate to add at the end of this section that ten days after the close of the Drama Magazine, Hsü Chih-mo and Lu Hsiao-man got married (3rd October). They left Peking on 15th October, to

spend their honeymoon in the south.(185) Hsü did not seem to have officially relinguished the editorship of the Supplement, for he asked Ch'ü Chü-nung to act on his behalf.(186) But evidently he did not resume the editorship afterwards. Starting from December, 1926, he entered a new period of life in Shanghai.(187)

C. Love life and love poems.

Hsü Chih-mo considered his second collection A Night in Florence (1927) "the vestige of a greater upheaval" in his life.(188) The "upheaval" affecting himself and others was nothing but his love affair with Lu Hsiao-man, and therefore it is natural that most of the verses in this particular volume centre on the theme of love, and most these love poems are linked with the development of his notorious romance.

It is interesting to note that immediately before Hsü set out on his "sentimental journey" to Europe in March, 1925, he and Lu Hsiao-man agreed not to write to each other so as to try to bury their past since they saw very little hope of possible union between them on account of the opposition of society and of all families concerned. But what they soon buried was only their hasty agreement, not their love.(189)

Hsü gave serious thought to his relationship with Lu Hsiao-man after leaving Peking. His first move was a daring one: he wrote to Hsiao-man's mother direct, imploring her to help Hsiao-man to a happy life by supporting the latter's divorce. But the old lady was utterly disgusted and exasperated, and was of course not to be persuaded.(190)

As to Hsiao-man, she just yielded to filial piety after some spectacular but futile struggle.(191) Hsü Chih-mo, undaunted, hit on a desperate idea. He wrote and urged Hsiao-man to desert her husband and join him in Europe.(192) There was a strong possibility that his elopement plan was promoted by his admiration for the Brownings and especially his visit to the grave of Mrs. Browning in Florence.(193) Apparently he had

not thought of such questions as what job to take, where to live and so on; he only wanted to "liberate" his lady-love and have her with him in Europe so that no Chinese condemnation or opposition could ever harm their love and freedom. The poem "Chüeh-tuan" (決斷) (Determination) was obviously the embodiment of his thought at that time. But Lu Hsiao-man was not Elizabeth Browning, and Hsü in the latter part of his stay in Florence was plunged into frustration and suffering. There he wrote at least two poems, i.e., "Shih-chü" (詩句) (Lines) and "Fei-leng-ts'ui ti i-yeh" (翡冷翠的一夜) (A Night in Florence).(194) The former is a sentimental manifestation of his sorrow apparently caused by the news from China about Hsiao-man's illness.(195) The latter, a much longer work with seventy-four lines, has led to the supposition that it may have been Hsü's actual experience or a phantasy concocted out of an experience in Florence.(196) In fact Hsü wrote this in the first person of Lu Hsiao-man who expressed her feelings just before the poet leaving Peking. There are a number of lines the words and ideas of which appear in the poet's letters and Hsiao-man's diary.(197) The lovers in the poem are supposed to meet in a Florentine olive garden on an early summer night. However, the setting is blended with a little Cambridge element - the three-arched bridge near Clare College that has been extolled for its exquisite beauty by Hsü in his famous essay "The Cambridge I Know". In this poem the poet recalled his departure from Peking about three months before, especially the night when a farewell party was held in his honour. Both he and Lu Hsiao-man were anxious to have a private word with each other but, being amidst other guests, they could only drown their sorrow in

wine.[198] The poet, instead of portraying what actually happened on that night, invented a sentimental story to gratify his ego, and so in the poem the restaurant, or somebody's home, became an olive garden; no electric light but stars; no people but the poet and his sweetheart; no hypocritical exchange of good wishes among so-called friends but the thrilling whispers of two mixed souls and the fusion of two burning hearts; no wine but the sweet kisses from the lovers' dewy lips; no human barriers but the companionship of natural scenery; no worldly and vulgar aspirations but the lofty ideal of love-death. Although this poem is not singularly remarkable, it is of great importance to the poet himself. It heads the second collection and is the title-poem of it.

After Florence Hsü proceeded to Paris. He was still fervently hoping that Lu Hsiao-man would eventually make up her mind to elope.[199] But Hsiao-man, however deeply in love with Hsü, was an irresolute character and did not have sufficient courage to overcome social criticism or resist the pressure from her parents. At first she claimed that she would rather maintain a platonic friendship with Hsü,[200] and then she even suggested that Hsü should try to switch back to his abandoned course and rekindle the old love between him and Lin Hui-yin.[201] Hsiao-man's final decision came on 17th July - a decision that shone with the light of the age-old Confucianism; she wrote:

> After all, I owe my life to my parents who are now already in their old age ... How can I cause their death because of me ... I should sacrifice myself.[202]

And she bade Hsü farewell in the same diary:

> From now on I hope you'll not give a thought to me. You are a promising person and your future is much brighter than mine. Don't destroy it on account of me .. I must go away ... but remember ... it is only my physical body; my warm throbbing heart still remains and waits here - waiting for you to take possession of it upon your return.(203)

Hsü knew little of the above writing while he was wandering in Europe.

After two weeks or so in Paris, Hsü again crossed the Channel. In England he saw Dickinson, Thomas Hardy and the Russells. When he was anticipating the pleasure of a few days' stay in Devon with the Elmhirsts, a telegram from Hsiao-man exploded all his plans.(204) Fearing for her illness and possible death, he cancelled all his engagements including his promise to wait for Tagore, and hurried back to Peking, without, of course, completing his education as he assured himself at the start of his "sentimental journey".(205)

The hopes and fears in the following months were almost too great for him to bear. Hsiao-man's state of mind rather than her health was the perpetual source of anxiety.(206) She did not really "go away" as she promised herself; on the contrary, she created opportunities for Hsü to see her and they later may have even gone to the extent of adultery.(207) Yet Hsiao-man on the other hand was her old self and did not feel strong enough to defy her parents. Sometimes she was pessimistic and preferred the <u>status quo</u> or adopted the indecisive attitude of, in her own words, <u>pu liao liao chih</u> (不了了之) (leaving it to fate);(208) but sometimes she

seemed quite determined to take positive actions, and one day even hastily agreed to elopement.(209) "Wo lai Yang-tzu chiang pien mai i-pa lien-p'eng" (我來揚子江邊買一把蓮蓬) (I've Come to the Bank of the Yangtzu River to Buy A Bunch of Lotus Seeds), "Ch'i-tsao i-tso ch'iang" (起造一座牆) (Let's Build A Wall), "Tsai pu chien Lei Feng" (再不見雷峯) (Gone Is the Lei Feng Pagoda) and possibly some others are Hsü's verses related to this excruciating period. And "Gone Is the Lei Feng Pagoda" was obviously Hsü's contradictory answer to Hsiao-man's weak and wretched stand of "leaving it to fate" which was to him an ignoble retreat and even a living death worse than the real one. The repetition of the line "Suppressing is less satisfying than burying" (third stanza) was therefore indicative of the poet's characteristic principle "All or Nothing".(210)

The last two weeks in September, 1925 was a dark period to Hsü and Lu Hsiao-man after they lost touch with each other. But the darkest hour was only the overture of the bright morning. Hsiao-man eventually and almost miraculously crushed all family and social obstructions and succeeded in divorcing her husband. But she did not know where Hsü was until she saw the new editor's name in the Supplement of the Morning Post one day.(211) The rest of the story of love was all sweetness and joy, for the battle in their life was won.

A few poems are representative of thse happy days. In "Wang-yüeh" (望月) (Gazing at the Moon) Hsü recorded the difficulties Hsiao-man experienced and how she finally achieved her victory in the fight for love. "Tsui-hou ti na i-t'ien" (最後的那一天) (The Judgement Day) was written more or less in the same vein; it conveyed the poet's thought about the love between himself and Hsiao-man which, according to him, was so pure and

genuine that it could stand any rigorous judgment even before God. "Pai-hsü ti hai-lao-erh" (白鬚的海老兒) (The Whit-Bearded Old Sea) was a product in the spring of 1926, only a few months after Hsiao-man had obtained her freedom. Chiang Fu-ts'ung was well acquainted with the story behind the poem and reported that Hsü, being all anxiety to see Hsiao-man, wrote the poem to relieve his feelings.(212)

Before we comment on the short lyric "T'ien-shen szu ti ying-hsiung" (天神似的英雄) (A Heavenly Hero), let us look at the letter Hsü wrote to Hsiao-man on 3rd March, 1925. Hsü revealed in it the three stages in his treatment of Hsiao-man: (a) He was on a higher spiritual or intellectual ground, bestowing his sympathy and love on his lady-love. (b) He regarded her as a person on the same footing as he, and her spirit gradually saturated his. (c) He affirmed that Hsiao-man was on a higher ground, her "noble and pure soul" being "the reflection of God's glory" and therefore he offered his "adoration and praise".(213) "A Heavenly Hero" symbolically depicted the third stage. Hsü considered himself a "heavenly hero" when he had won Lu Hsiao-man whose celestial beauty added glamour to him by reflection.

Hsü was probably under the influence of Hardy's "She, to Him" and "At Wynyard's Gap" in terms of poetic form when he wrote "Liang-ti hsiang-szu" (兩地相思) (Love Thoughts in Two Places). Its first part was supposed to be Hsü's own words and the second part, Hsiao-man's. In view of some lines which revealed Hsiao-man's irresolution and submission to circumstances, this poem, while clearly indicating by its content its connection with the time of Hsü's travel in Europe, could not have been written before Hsü's return to Peking since

he could not have learned of Hsiao-man's feelings while still in Europe.

A Night in Florence by the fact of its comprising thirty-six poems (excluding a few translations) shows that Hsü was literarily quite productive when Lu Hsiao-man was still Mrs. Wang Keng. However, after their victory of love in October, 1925, there soon ensued in Hsü's literary life an oppresive stagnation which, as he told his readers, made "the nib of the pen heavy". His facility in writing seemed to have suddenly and inscrutably gone, leaving him the feeling of "all the pores of the body being covered up with petroleum jelly".(214) As a writer and in terms of literary creation, he faced a disaster. He did not hold the domestic political or social situation, however depressing it may have been, responsible for the threatening crisis. He believed that the cause of his "illness" must have come from his life. But on analyzing it he found himself extremely fortunate, both in finance and in love, and he did not discover any "suppressed desires" racking himself psychologically. He felt incapable of making a satisfactory diagnosis, but he seemed in a way to agree with others that his fortunate life might be the very reason for his literary inertness.(215) In another essay, he reiterated his bewilderment, but asserted that he had realized his need of a definite philosophy of life. He believed that he could not afford to fight blindly in the darkness of life.(216) "Tsai hsiu-kuai wo-ti lien ch'en" (再休怪我的臉沉) (Don't Blame Me for Pulling A Long Face) was a poem most illustrative of his mental restlessness and uneasiness. In it he addressed Lu Hsiao-man, first reaffirming his love for her and then unbosoming his own distress. He believed the stagnation in himself could be removed by Hsiao-man, his

fountain-head of love; to her he made the desperate "S O S":

> Give me courage; I need strength.
> Come quick to save this town now besieged;
> Don't blame me for pulling a long face.
> Come quick, Dearest, embrace my thought.
>
> (Last stanza of "Don't Blame Me for Pulling A Long Face")

But he soon began to descry his mistake. His gradual awakening to hard facts was such an agonizing and disillusioning process that eventually he felt utterly crushed. But before we deal with this crisis of his in the next chapter, we shall complete this one by examining other poems in A Night in Florence.

D. Other poems.

1. Social poems.

There are only a few social poems in Hsü's second collection. "Ta-shuai" (大帥) (The Marshal) may be taken as the continuation of "A Scene of Peace" in the first collection and these two become more meaningful if read together. "A Scene of Peace" as discussed in last chapter presents a picture of the innocent soldiers engaged in the civil war; "The Marshal" informs the reader of the death of many of them in the front and how they, sardine-like, are roughly shovelled into a pit. A few of them, fatally wounded but not quite dead, are buried alive. The poet skilfully points out the villain responsible for the cruelty, namely the "Marshal", or the warlord concerned. The economy of words and the effortless flow of the dialogue account for the success of this poem. It imparts a great deal of information, and its moving power is much greater than a prosaic report of say two thousand words. This piece and the exquisite lyric "Tsai pieh K'ang-ch'iao" (再別康橋) (Farewell Again to Cambridge) of the third collection are the only two poems of Hsü that appear in an anthology in mainland China after the establishment of the People's Republic.(217)

"Jen pien shou" (人變獸) (Man Turned Beast) with its sub-title "War-Song No.2" is evidently meant for reading in conjunction with "The Marshal" whose sub-title is "War-Song No.1". This second war-song carries on the same theme, but the emphasis is on the suffering

of the peasant folk. The condemnation, which is of the highest severity in Chinese since the poet reviles those devastating the country as shameless beasts, is directed against the warlords, but it is only implied. It would seem that Hsü had less patience with the warlords after the publication of his first collection; however, he did not appear to have changed his basic socio-political attitude that China's troubles were not created by a handful of militarists but were the results of the sins, i.e., supineness, cowardice and meanness, of the whole nation.(218)

"Lu-shan shih-kung ko" (廬山石工歌) (Song of the Lu-shan Masons) needs no elaborate elucidation since the letter attached at the end of the poem tells us almost everything about its origin, its background and the poet's feelings. What remains to be said is that in this seemingly humanitarian verse the poet's message is not the hardship of the masons but their indefatigable spirit.(219) In spite of the height of the mountain, the heat of the sun on a fine day and the rain and lightning on a stormy day, theirs is the perpetual slogan for work, the heroic battle cry "Up the mountain, up the mountain, go!" This agrees perfectly with the poet's Nietzschean outlook on life. It is always the unceasing "up!" It is always the "everlasting yea!"

Both "Yün-ming ti lo-chi" (運命的邏輯) (The Logic of Destiny) and "Tsui yü fa" (罪與罰) (Sin and Retribution) concern the fate of the female. The three stages in the former are the three stages covering the whole life of a socialite who degenerates to a prostitute and finally to a beggar. "Sin and Retribution" is a story about some women, with special reference to one called Chi (箕), being wronged by a man.

Comparing thsee two poems, we see that Hsü had no sympathy with the woman in "The Logic of Destiny" - probably because she was vain and chose a gay life on purpose in the beginning, and therefore her misery in her old age was the very fruit she should gather from the seed she had sown in her young days. But the poet stood up in defence of Chi in "Sin and Retribution". Just like Thomas Hardy, Hsü did not censure those women who fell victims of circumstances though their conduct might be termed "loose" by the conventional sector of society. His verdict on Chi was: "She is innocent!"

Further, we may note in passing that the women in Hsü's poetry often appear as suffers, but they, on the other hand, possess all the virtues like courage, sense of righteousness, faithfulness, endurance, gentleness, filial piety, and even patriotism;(220) and, as if being held up to ridicule, almost all the male characters in Hsü are rather villainous. This peculiar treatment of man and woman is a salient feature in Tagore and there is the possibility of the Indian poet's influence on Hsü. And it is true that the association of suffering and virtue is perpetuated and almost immortalized in Hsü's prose works.(221) China in the twenties staged different kinds of human tragedies year after year and in the poet's eyes, men were the creators of all miseries but women proved to be the first to reap the fruit of disasters.

If "Yu i-tz'u shih-yen" (又一次試驗) (Yet Another Experiment) is skilfully translated into English, it may well be "smuggled" into any of Hardy's collection without damaging the general Hardyan mood. Indeed, the poem is not only Hardyan but Biblical in content since it owes its inspiration fundamentally to

the creation story in Genesis. The poet reports that God re-creates the human reac; he uses the same raw material - earth, but this time he bestows on the new species "the breath of life" only in the physical sense. The man of the second creation no longer has God's "spirit". In the opinion of the poet, man as a created being with God's own spirit has virtually lost his inherent dignity by committing acts such as "spite, suspicion and cruelty".(222) In other words, man has "turned beast" and it follows that God in his second creation should not waste his spirit on man. In this seemingly funny and joyous poem there is some latent cynicism, condemnation and anger. The poet passed his sentence on mankind: "The holy have become the filthy" (2nd line, last stanza). These words were the sequel of his socio-political views concerning the Chinese domestic situation, and the thought behind the poem was in fact the same as that which can more readily be seen in "The Marshal" and "Man Turned Beast".

The Whitmanesque or Carpenterian vigour in some social poems of the first collection lingers on in a small measure in "Song of the Lu-shan Masons", but no longer exists in the other social poems which generally betray a strong influence of Hardy. From the socialist point of view as prevalent in China and other socialist countries, this signifies Hsü's increased impotence in the struggle for social justice and revolution. While his fellow poet Kuo Mo-jo was yelling out more and more defiant slogans,(223) Hsü refrained from overt angry denunciation and assumed a more gentle voice, a more subdued tone. His growing tendency towards the dispassionate way of recording Life's phenomena therefore cannot be rated higher than an abject surrender to the

reactionary ruling bourgeoisie. But from another point of view, the implications in his social poems grew more mature. His assimilation of Hardy has enabled him to produce poems which, albeit carrying the unmistakable Hardyan tone and mood, are equally unmistakably Chinese and "Hsü Chih-mo -ist" with some exceptions such as "Yet Another Experiment". His is not merely slavish but creative imitation.

2. Reflective poems.

The few pieces that can be categorized as reflective poems in A Night in Florence concern life and ideal. Both "Si-po-li-ya tao-chung i Hsi-hu Ch'iu-hsüeh An lu-se tso ko" (西伯利亞道中憶西湖秋雪庵蘆色作歌) (A Song Written on My Journey through Siberia in Remembrance of the Reeds in Front of the Autumn-Snow Convent near the West Lake) and "Tsai Ai-k'e-ch'a-tuo chiao-t'ang ch'ien" (在哀克剎脫教堂前) (In Front of the Cathedral of Exeter) were written when the poet was travelling alone in foreign countries - the time was just right for reflection since his travel was to some extent an aimless wandering and exile. There is nothing new in them as far as the poet's meditation on life is concerned. These poems still ask such ultimate questions as "What is life?" and from which only bewilderment ensues. Hardy could not solve the riddle of life even in his eighties and it is doubtful whether Hsü could have solved it even if he had attained Hardy's great age. The "Song" probably interests the reader more by its

lyricism or its subtle reference to the poet's sad love story associated with Lin Hui-yin than anything else.(224) However, the fifth stanza is highly prophetic:

> The reed-waves were then dancing in the
> moonlight,
> I quietly contemplate the mystery of life;
> A new song of it I was about to write -
> Oh, the reed-pipe, broken, can sing no more!

It is precisely the last scene of Hsü's life in 1931:(225) he, with his characteristic Nietzschean effort, was struggling to free himself from many vexing problems and was about to anticipate a regeneration,(226) but all of a sudden death forced its way in, and solved the riddle of life for him. If we agree with Ping Hsin that "The tone and mood of Chih-mo's poems in every way head for an end of destruction",(227) we should think the stanza quoted above typical.

As to "Pien yü pu pien" (變與不變) (Change and No Change), it is not clear when exactly it was written, but its message and language resemble those in "Na i-tien shen-ming ti huo-yen" (那一點神明的火焰) (That Atom of God-like Flame) which was published on 25th March, 1925.(228) In both poems the poet affirms the immutability of something which is styled variously as "stars", "soul", "a ray of light", and "the atom of God-like flame". All these mystic appelations can be loosely equated with others like hsing-ling (性靈) (true self), ling-hsing (靈性) (spirit), kuo-hun (國魂) (national soul), jen-ke (人格) (character), li-hsiang (理想) (ideal), tan-ch'un hsin-yang (單純信仰) (simple faith) and ching-shen yung-kan (精神勇敢) (mental courage) which are repeatedly mentioned and honoured in Hsü's

prose works.[229] This vital substance, or quality or whatever it is, according to Hsü, "does not necessarily carry a mysterious, religious connotation - that would be too narrow; it includes all meaningful and purposeful actions".[230] And when he expounded his idea with reference to an individual he asserted:

> A man has a spirit or soul if he is aware of his own natural endowments and his own mission, and strives forever dauntlessly in hopes of fulfilling the meaning of his own life.[231]

These words obviously imply that a man has no "spirit" or "soul" unless he meets the conditions laid down in the above quotation. In this connection, in an extended sense, few persons will attain the enviable stage of possessing a "spirit" or "soul", for most people are not particularly conscious of their "mission" in life, and even if they are, not many of them are prepared to take the Nietzschean stand to "strive forever dauntlessly". But Hsü certainly thought himself a man above the average man; the last stanza of "That Atom of God-like Flame" shows his confidence of his possessing a "soul" and even of his attainment of something like immortality:

> Time will demand my dust, and my heart will
> cease to beat,
> But in the infinite dust of time there still
> remains that atom -
> That atom of God-like flame, throbbing,
> flashing,
> No change!
> No change!

Hsü's peculiar idea about the "soul" is almost identical with that conceived by John Keats, one of the

English romantic poets he admires. Hsü's friend John Middleton Murry had made some enlightening statements about Keats relating to this aspect:

> What he [Keats] means by the soul is peculiar, and important. Men are not born with a soul. They come into the world as sparks of the divine intelligence, or atoms of perception; but 'they are not souls till they acquire identities, till each one is personally itself'. In other words, the soul of the true self; and it is achieved or created by the submission of the Intelligence, or Mind, to the Heart, which 'must feel and suffer in a thousand diverse ways' in the world of pains and troubles which is seen to be necessary to this process of soul-creation.(232)

The Keatsian concept of the necessity of suffering can also be appreciated in "Change and No Change" and "That Atom of God-like Flame", and is discussed in several essays by Hsü.(233) Moreover, a short lyric, which, not included in any of Hsü's collection of verse but inserted in an essay, is especially revealing with regard to this point:

> I avoid no sufferings, for I desire to know
> you, God;
> I am willing, willing to exist in flames
> So that I can see my true self at the final time.
> To see my true self - that's my determination, God.
> No hesitation!(234)

Yeh Ch'ing (葉青) in reviewing Hsü's poetry complained against A Night in Florence and the last two collections for their want of philosophy.(235) Preoccupied with his "orthodox" Marxism, he, just the opposite of Chu Hsiang, did not deem any verse good poetry unless he could find a great deal of philosophical thought in it. But in view of what has been discussed above, we can hardly agree

with Yeh. Truly, Hsü during 1925 and 1926 was more concerned with his love affair than anything else and A Night in Florence tells the fact, but he never quite forgot his jen-sheng che-li (人生哲理) (life and philosophical thought, or reasoning) which troubled him in a peculiar and individual way.

E. Forms, language and imagery.

1. Forms.

A Night in Florence shows Hsü's continued experiment with stanza forms ranging from two to twelve lines. He, like Hardy, did not seek to follow established patterns but was inclined to creating new ones. In "Hai yün" (海韻) (Melody of the Sea), for instance, despite each stanza having nine lines, there is nothing Spenserian in it because of the irregular length of the lines. Further, although Hsü praised Keats's "Ode to A Nightingale", he did not try the ode form. In this connection, again the quatrain is predominant, but an interesting feature is seen in the several poems with five-line stanzas. For example, the summary of a key thought is allocated to the last line in each stanza in "I've Come to the Bank of the Yangtzu River to Buy A Bunch of Lotus Seeds", "The Judgment Day" and "Che nien-t'ou huo cho pu i" (這年頭活着不易) (It Is Not Easy to Earn A Living in These Years). This is exactly like Thomas Hardy's "Going and Staying"(236) though Hardy's last line is short while Hsü's is comparatively long.

Another interesting point is that in "I've Come to the Bank" and "The Judgment Day", the five-line stanza can well be taken for an extended quatrain since the last line functioning mainly as a strengthening element for the preceding four lines. If it were removed, the stanza could still stand alone without suffering great damage as far as the overall meaning of the poem is concerned though a little detail would be missing.

"San-yüeh shih-erh shen-yeh Ta-ku-k'ou wai" (三月十二深夜大沽口外) (Outside Ta-ku-k'ou at Mid-Night,

March 12) is the only poem with six-line stanzas, the long lines in which, analogous to those at the end of every stanza in "I've Come to the Bank" and "The Judgment Day", are all key lines. Their importance and self-sufficiency are so unique that assembling them we have a new poem comparable to the longer original:

今夜困守在大沽口外，
桅上的孤燈在風前搖擺.
你說不自由是這變亂的時光，
今天的希望變作明天的悵惘，
我此時在淒冷的甲板上徘徊，
只一絲雲影在這湖心裏晃動.

(To-night I'm shut off outside Ta-ku-k'ou;
The single jack-lamp at the mast is shaking
in the wind.
Do you say lack of freedom is the sign of
these chaotic days?
To-day's hope will become to-morrow's sorrow.
Now I move to and fro on the cold, sad deck;
Only the hazy shadow of a cloud is dancing
on the lake of my heart.)

Hsü Chih-mo admitted that all Poetry Magazine poets were at least in some measure influenced by Wen I-to.(237) As some poems in A Night in Florence were written during or after the Poetry Magazine period, Wen's influence would be there if anywhere. In terms of stanza forms, however, we have every reason to believe that Hsü

did not accept Wen's theory on "beauty of architecture" without some modification. Indeed, there are only a couple of poems, i.e,, "Gazing at the Moon", "Mei hsüeh cheng ch'un" (梅雪爭春) (The Contest for Beauty in Spring between Plum Blossoms and Snow) and "T'a p'a t'a shuo ch'u k'ou" (她怕他說出口) (She Is Afraid That He Will Say It) which conform to Wen's strict standard as exemplified in his monumental product "Dead Water", and therefore "dry bean-curd poems", "square figure poems" and similar depreciative designations cannot be indiscriminately applied to Hsü who, as discussed previously, did not believe in the uniformity of words and lines in a poem.(238) But it is equally true that there is an "architecture" of his own. For instance, "Don't Blame Me for Pulling A Long Face" in terms of stanza form is, generally, regular; the number of characters in every quatrain is 10, 7, 7, 10 but, as is characteristic of Hsü, in one stanza we find the variation of 10, 7, 7, 11. "Hsin ts'ui-chuang ch'ü" (新催粧曲) (A New Bride's Song), "Yet Another Experiment) and "Pan-yeh shen-hsiang p'i-p'a" (半夜深巷琵琶) (Hearing the P'i-p'a at Mid-Night), etc. more or less follow the same principle - a streak of irregularity amid the regularity.

Hsü's "beauty of architecture" realized in stanza form is largely an imitation of Hardy. A glance at Late Lyrics and Earlier, probably the most familiar work of Hardy to Hsü, will convince us of Hsü's debt to the great English poet in this particular aspect.(239) The pattern of shorter lines among longer lines in a stanza, conspicuous both in Hardy and in Hsü, may be architecturally even more pleasing to the eye than any stanza of square or oblong shape.

In A Night in Florence we also discern Hsü's budding interest in longer poems. The title-poem may be regarded as the first sign. Stanza form is rather irrelevant in this work, for the whole poem is just one long stanza, or more precisely, one long verse paragraph.

"Determination" is an interesting piece not only in A Night in Florence but also in the corpus of Hsü's poetical works. The number of words in every quatrain falls in the general pattern of 3, 6, 3, 6, with a little variation. The short length of the lines is striking; in fact the first line of the eighth stanza has only one single character! Such a stanza form helps to achieve the intensity and anxiety of feeling and the fighting spirit and determination of the poet.

Some people seem to think that Hsü Chih-mo experimented extensively with English metrical forms. The supposition may have arisen from the fact that yin-chieh (音節) (lilt) was discussed and stressed during the Poetry Magazine period.(240) Jao Meng-k'ang was the chief spokesman on this subject and his words were endorsed by Wen I-to.(241) But it must be pointed out that in Jao's expounding of his or his and Wen's theory, yin-chieh was a comprehensive thing; it was supposed to include ke-tiao (格調) (form), chieh-chou (節奏) (rhythm), p'ing-tse (平仄) (tones) and yün-chiao (韻脚) (rhymes), and the total effect was music.(242) Hsü may or may not have entirely agreed with Jao, but what he stressed was "internal rhythm" about which he said: "Its variation and mystery in practice is inexhaustible and inexplicable." Obviously yin-chieh in his understanding was not confined to a mere association with external metrical patterns, English or others', but it was something mysterious and linked with inspiration.(243)

There does not seem to be strong evidence that Hsü experimented with metrical patterns like iambus, trochee, etc. Indeed, although it is easy to scan a Chinese line in the English way if Chinese characters are treated as English syllables, it would be rather meaningless for any Chinese poet to write that way simply because the Chinese language is not English, and it is impossible to equate a Chinese character with an English syllable for a stressed or unstressed effect.(244) In order to produce good music in verse, Hsü seemed to aim at "the harmony and flow of the internal rhythm" which "originate from genuine 'poetic sentiment'."(245) This would be another way of saying "The father of rhythm is God"(246) since Hsü's "poetic sentiment" was "inspiration".(247) Further, Hsü praised Hardy for the "organic whole" in the latter's verse,(248) and we may assume that Hsü himself also strove for that.

To realize the "organic whole" seemed to involve experimentation chiefly with stanza forms, rhymes, poetic language and imagery. If he had tried the English metrical patterns at all, he would have soon found it a cul de sac rather than a thoroughfare. Lu Chih-wei (陸志韋)'s experiment he knew, and he did not appear to have taken up Lu's abandoned task.(249) As stanza forms have been discussed and poetic language and imagery are treated separately, what remains to be looked at is rhyme. On this subject we can afford to be brief.

Generally Hsü was rather slipshod in his rhymes. This defect was as obvious in A Night in Florence as in Chih-mo's Poems. Imperfect rhymes like yeh (葉)and yen (艷); ai (愛) and lan (爛); k'e (客) and mo (默); t'u (土) and tso (做), etc.(250) can easily be found and no wonder, even in the early years, Chu Hsiang

criticized him and Hu Shih advised him to write unrhymed verse instead.(251) As a "new" poet, of course nobody would blame him for jettisoning the traditional way of rhyming, but he would be expected to observe at least the pronunciation of kuo-yü, the national language. But from another point of view, if we do not frown on the "cockney rhyme"(252) in English and perhaps even take a step further to support Louis MacNeice's thesis that "man" and "pain"; "drop" and "up"; "silent" and "salient" etc. are new and acceptable rhymes in English,(253) Hsü might be acquitted of the crime of "imperfection". Indeed, he might even be acclaimed as an innovator who broke new ground in modern Chinese rhymes! After all, whether Hsü's are contemptible bad rhymes or laudable "new" rhymes depends on individual taste and judgment. As for himself, he did not appear to think he was revolutionizing Chinese rhymes; he seemed to cherish the identical idea with Lu Hsün that "rhymes of roughly similar sounds" should be quite adequate for pai-hua verse.(254)

Some space is devoted to prose poems and free verse under the section of "Forms" in last chapter; although there is not much to be said about them here, we may as well add a few remarks for the sake of comparison.

Actually, A Night in Florence contains no prose poems or free verse. The most "free" piece in it is the title-poem "A Night in Florence" which, comparable in form to "A Farewell to Cambridge" in the first collection, can be regarded as written in a kind of adapted English blank verse. "The Song of Lu-shan Masons" looks "free", but a rough rhyming scheme does exist, however irregular it may be. We may conclude that with the publication of A Night in Florence, Hsü entered upon the stage of regulated verse.

However, we may note in passing that the

abandonment of prose poems is only a transference of energy and genre in Hsü's literary creation, for he wrote more and more poetized prose after 1924. Such essays as "Hsiang fei" (想飛) (Wanting to Fly), "Fei-leng-ts'ui shan-chü hsien-hua" (翡冷翠山居閒話) (Casual Talk by A Dweller in the Florentine Hills), "Pai-lun" (拜倫) (Byron), etc. require only a little adaptation to be transformed into prose poems.

All socialist critics agree that in terms of technique, A Night in Florence with its relative regularity of stanza forms looks fine and elegant, but there is the deplorable poverty of content. Mao Tun in answering the general question "Why so?" advanced the theory that the regularity in form, being a manifestation of the pursuit of beauty, was due to the poet's political frustration.(255) In other words, the poet retreated to the haven of poetry after failing to see his political ideal materialized. While it is true that poetic technique, like many other artistic understakings, can provide shelter for talented, and even non-talented, frustrated souls, Mao Tun's exclusively political interpretation is inadequate in Hsü's case. Actually most of the poems in A Night in Florence are not closely linked with the poet's political thought or political experience. The few (chiefly the social poems) that are can hardly be branded as products of the ivory tower. Indeed, it is unconvincing to associate regularity in poetic forms with political frustration as something inevitable and even absolute. Slogan verse, especially that of the leftist type, is often regular in form, and the authors of such work may not necessarily be politically frustrated. In fact poetry in present-day China is by and large regular in form and rhymed, and yet the communist poets do not turn to regularity because of

frustration. To return to Hsü Chih-mo: his growing interest in regular poetic forms is mainly the result of Wen I-to's influence, or to put it in another way, Hsü's engagement in the regulated verse movement. Hardy, on the other hand, is definitely also a decisive factor. We learn from Hsü's own account of his interview with the English poet that even before the start of the regulated verse movement, Hsü already admired Hardy's poetry for its "structural precision like architecture" as well as its "thought";(256) the pursuit for beauty reinforced by d'Annunzio might also have something to do with it.

Hsü in his experiments with various aspects of poetic forms does not show any inflexibility. His informal nature, his belief in and pursuit of inspiration, and his awareness of both the beauty and the monotony present in Wen I-to's strict ke-lü account for the measure of flexibility in him;(257) and so in his creative work, his irregularity in regularity, or from the purist's viewpoint, his "imperfection", represents the subtle eclecticism in his approach to experimentation in forms.

2. Language.

In A Night in Florence there is hardly any residue of wen-yen clichés which are glaring defects in some of Hsü's early verses. Two-character wen-yen expressions do remain, for instance, "ou-erh" (偶爾) (occasionally); "cheng-chung" (怔忡) (feeling anxious); "k'an-k'o" (坎坷) (unevenness); "ts'o-t'o" (蹉跎) (linger), etc.(258) As they have all been

"naturalized", they help rather than harm the lyricism. The crudeness and stiffness sometimes detected in his earlier works on the whole have given place to a general smoothness though in one or two cases the phraseology still strikes the reader as queer, for example, "i-ko huo kua ti chi" (一個活寡的急) (the sexual thirst of a woman whose husband is impotent).(259)

Duplication of words is extensively used in this collection and its occurrence, especially in adjectival form, points to the poet's aspiration for musical effect. It is interesting to note that "In Front of the Cathedral of Exeter" and "Kuo-t'i-hai hsin-hun ch'ü" (渦提孩新婚曲) (The Wedding Song of Undine), contrary in mood, one contemplative and gloomy and the other happy and gay, both contain a fairly large number of phrases with duplicated words which help to create the individual atmosphere of the respective poems. A few pairs taken from them for comparison will confirm this point: "ch'iao yin yin" (峭陰陰) (gloomy) and "hsiao ying ying" (笑盈盈) (laughing); "leng yü yü" (冷鬱鬱) (cold) and "nuan jung jung" (暖溶溶) (warm); "yu yu ti" (幽幽的) (quiet) and "nau jang jang" (鬧嚷嚷) (noisy).

Repetition of synonyms is no longer a defect in this collection. The prarllelism in "Sin and Retribution", though recognizable, does not really mar the poem since it is moderately and sensibly distributed.(260)

Wen I-to in his "Dead Water", which he considered a model of regulated verse, used adjectives of two to three characters in accordance with his theory on "erh-tzu yin-ch'ih" (二字音尺) (two-character rhythm division) and "san-tzu yin-ch'ih" (三字音尺) (three-character rhythm division).(261) Hsü Chih-mo certainly did not honour such rigid rules. The poems in A Night in Florence have many

phrases (mainly adjectives) composed of four or even five characters in addition to those with two to three characters. For example, "chen hsien-yen ti" (真鮮艷的) (really bright), "pai yü nien ti" (百餘年的) (over a hundred years), "shih-san ling t'ung ti" (十三齡童的) (of a boy of thirteen years old), "szu-jen shen-shang ti" (死人身上的) (relating to the dead), etc. Some have as many as six characters: "ni wo ai ch'iang nei ti" (你我愛牆內的) (of what is within our love-wall), "yü-mao chen pieh liao ti" (羽毛浸癟了的) (with feathers all soaked through), etc.(262) Long adjectives are generally more literary than shorter ones; but this does not imply that the poems in this collection are more literary than others. On the contrary, dialogue appears in so many of the poems that a conversational style is conspicuous. Colloquialism, a little less strong than it is in Chih-mo's Poems, is dispersed in the dialogue.(263)

Onomatopoetic effect is quite strong in both "Melody of the Sea" and "The Wedding Song of Undine". While it is not easy for everybody to identify the lines as echoes either of the ebb or of the surge of the tide,(264) it is not difficult even for the non-specialist to appreciate the melody of the sea when reading the former poem aloud. The resonant long "ang" and "o" sounds do represent the ebb and surge of the tide. In the "Wedding Song", words beginning with the "l" sound are the transmitters of the music of the flowing stream and the river. The poet did have a musical ear though he was not a musician.

A Night in Florence, at least in terms of language, shows Hsü Chih-mo to be a maturer poet.

3. Imagery.

With what has already been said in last chapter relating to imagery, the present section can only be a short one.

The imagery in A Night in Florence is a continuation of that in Chih-mo's Poems, and the night, with its associated images, is even more predominant. But this does not necessarily mean that the poems in the second collection are more gloomy than those in the first. Indeed, some poems in A Night in Florence were written after Lu Hsiao-man was won and rang with a triumphant note. And yet the night is there. Obviously the explanation lies in the poet's love for "mysterious beauty"(265) which, naturally, the night rather than the day provides. As far as this point is concerned, only a detailed investigation of Hsü's addiction to Keats's "Ode to A Nightingale" will reveal the full picture of the idea of mysterious beauty in Hsü. Suffice it to say that beginning from "tender is the night" the beauty of the night in the "Ode" is swallowed whole by Hsü down to the mysterious word "forlorn" and then on to the very end: "Do I wake or sleep?"(266) Hsü was ecstatic about the music unheard; likewise, he loved the beauty that was not seen, or was only dimly seen in the mystery of night. "The poetic soul in the darkness of forest smells the fragrance of the unseen flowers and grass"(267) was to him a highly charming and intriguing thought. Indeed, his inspiration and inclination for work seemed to be present mostly at night. In his life, the day was often devoted to friends and many external activities, and only the night was the time for his soul to roam and explore at large.(268)

It may be noted in passing that the star in "A Night in Florence" represents the poet himself as guide to his lady-love. In other contexts, as noted previously, the star in Hsü is ideal or ideals.

The years 1925 and 1926 in Hsü's life resemble a typical English day in early spring, cloudy, grey, showery but not without some bright periods. Happily the "evening" is a glorious one when the fight for love is over. "The Wedding Song of Undine" is a symbol in the respect. It is the most joyous and sunniest piece in the volume, and actually in the whole corpus of Hsü's poetical works. The poem discloses the poet's capability of handling the day imagery, but he in most cases chooses to neglect it for the cultivation of his devotion to the night. All this seems to point to a romantic tendency - what is obvious, tangible and visible is less desirable than what is obscure, tantalizing and only dimly discerned.

N O T E S

(Chapter three)

1. See CW, III, p. 396.

2. See Hsü Chih-mo, "Liang-ko shih-chieh ti lao-t'ou-erh ti lai-hsin".

3. CW, IV, p. 352.

4. CW, VI, pp. 305 f.

5. It is clear from Tagore's diary that he was already on his way home by 9th Feb. 1925; see Tagore, The Diary of A Westward Voyage, p. 73.

6. The term "sentimental journey" (kan-ch'ing tso-yung ti lü-hsing) (感情作用的旅行) appears in Hsü's writing in quotations (CW, VI, p. 305); he may have borrowed it from Laurence Sterne's A Sentimental Journey (1768).

7. Quotation from Leo Ou-fan Lee, op. cit., note No. 176, chapter 4. According to Lee, the original is from CPFK, 8th May, 1925. I have been unable to obtain this particular issue of CPFK.

8. An attempt is made to explain why d'Annunzio did not grant Hsü an interview in G. Leung, "Hsü Chih-mo and Italy".

9. For instance compare Hsü's essays "Tan-nung-hsüeh-wu" and "Tan-nung-hsüeh-wu ti ch'ing-nien ch'i" with C. H. Herford's writings such as: "Gabriele d'Annunzio" and "The Higher Mind of Italy". For details see G. Leung, ibid., note No. 66.

10. See Hsü Chih-mo, "Tan-nung-hsüeh-wu ti hsiao-shuo".

11. For these essays see note Nos. 9 f.

12. See Yü's "Preface" in Hsü Chih-mo and Lu Hsiao-man, Pien K'un-kang. The title of the book is a Chinese personal name. Yü may be regarded as one of Hsü's literary associates; see this chapter, p. 225.

13. For such essays see CW, III, pp. 197-229, IV, 91-107.

14. For details see Hsü's letters to Lu Hsiao-man and his diary in CW, IV.

15. See Hsü's "Art and Life", pp. 296-310.

16. See Hsü's "Tan-nung-hsüeh-wu ti ch'ing-nien ch'i".

17. G. Leung, op. cit.

18. It must be mentioned that Hsü went to Italy from England; after his stay in Florence and Paris he again crossed the Channel.

19. See Hsü's "Yeh-chien Ha Tai ti i-ko hsia-wu" (謁見哈代的一個下午) (The Afternoon I Saw Hardy), in CW, VI, pp. 303-312. This essay first appeared in CPFK, 27th May, 1926 under the title of "Ha T'i" (哈提) (Hardy). Part of the essay is a direct quotation from another essay of his entitled "T'ang-mai-szu Ha Tai ti shih" (湯麥司哈代的詩) (Thomas Hardy's Poetry) (see CW, VI, pp. 175-213). This latter work first appeared in Tung-fang tsa-chih (東方雜誌), XXI:2, 1924 as reported in CW, VI, p. 213; I also discovered it in the 20th anniversary special issue of this particular magazine published in July, 1924, pp. M 6-23.

20. P. Sargant Florence, "The Cambridge Heretics, 1909-1932", p. 233.

21. See CW, I, pp. 243-252, 257-262. "Sung t'a ti tsang" (送他的葬) with its original English title "At His Funeral" (CW, I, p. 255) might also be a translation from Hardy, but I could not locate it in Hardy's Collected Poems.

22. See CW, VI, p. 186.

23. See chapter 2, p. 82.

24. CW, VI, p. 145.

25. CW, VI, pp. 184 f.

26. The essay was published in CPFK, 20th May, 1926.

27. CW, II, p. 465.

28. CW, VI, p. 298.

29. See CW, VI, p. 192.

30. Thomas Hardy, The Collected Poems of Thomas Hardy, p. 75. For Hsü's "Hardyan poems" see CW, II, pp. 201-203, 207, 253-255, 270-273, 304-306, 307 f., 321-330, 507-511.

31. See Liang Shih-ch'iu, T'an Hsü Chih-mo, p. 50.

32. It must be pointed out that this does not apply to his pronunciation which is not free from his original Chekiang accent; see Liang Shih-ch'iu's quotation of Wu Yung's account in Liang, ibid. p. 51.

33. Cyril Birch gives a brief account of Hardy's influence on Hsü in his "Hsü Chih-mo's Debt to Thomas Hardy (Abstract)", pp. 73-77. A forth-coming book by him deals with some of Hsü's poems.

34. See note No. 21 of this chapter. All these translations can be seen from CW, I, pp. 235-238, 243-252, 253-256 (this may or may not be Hardy's work), 257-262; II, pp. 274, 275 f. (same as I, pp. 235-238), 289-292, 471-480; VI, pp. 81-88.

35. In CW, I, pp. 243-246, 257-262; VI, pp. 81-88.

36. We may as well note in passing that Hsü's translations of other writers are all readable but not scrupulously faithful. In one case at least, he enjoyed his freedom to such an extent as to add two long paragraphs of his own words to the translation concerned without bothering to give any note or explanation. This incident was tracked down by his friend Ch'en Yüan later after the publication of the translation in book form. See CW, VI, pp. 375 f.; IV, pp. 678-680, the latter reference covering the two paragraphs added by Hsü to his translation of Undine.

37. See Lu Hsün. op. cit. XXII, p. 11.

38. See CW, III, p. 85.

39. Hsü's letter to Arthur Waley dated 21st Feb. 1924.

40. See Hsü Chih-mo, " Wo wei-shen-mo lai pan wo hsiang tsen-mo pan".

41. Hsü's letter to L. K. Elmhirst dated 15th July, 1925.

42. Mainly Ch'en Po-sheng and Huang Tzu-mei, who held responsible positions in the Morning Post. Hsü knew Ch'en long before he returned to China from abroad; see CW, III, p. 543.

43. See Hsü Chih-mo, op. cit.

44. See CW, IV, pp. 306, 332 f.

45. CW, III, p. 408.

46. See Hsü Chih-mo, op. cit.

47. See Hsü Chih-mo, op. cit.

48. CW, III, p. 440.

49. CW, III, p. 436.

50. CW, III, p. 443.

51. CW, III, pp. 407 f.

52. CW, III, p. 442.

53. See Ch'en Ch'i-hsiu, "Ti-kuo chu-i yu pai-se ho ch'ih-se chih pieh ma". Ch'en was a university professor.

54. See Chang Hsi-jo, "Su-o chiu-ching shih pu-shih wo-men ti p'eng-yu". Chang was educated in China, America and England. He taught political science in different universities and was well-known for his learning as well as for his opposition to the Kuomintang. He holds important government posts in the People's Republic of China. His early anti-communist activities, however, are often overlooked by most historians.

55. See Hsü, "Yu ts'ung Su-o hui chiang tao fu-k'an" and also "Ch'ou yu ch'ih pai ti ch'ou yu ch'ih pai".

56. See CW, III, pp. 349-378. The special reference to the communist activities in Kwangtung province is on p. 376. It must be noted that the essay "Ch'ou O yü fan-tui kung-ch'an"(仇俄與反對共產) (Hating Russia and Opposing Communism) in CW, VI, pp. 223-228 is not Hsü's at all. It was written by [Chang] Hsi-jo and published in CPFK, 22nd Oct. 1925 under the title of "Lien O yü fan-tui kung-ch'an" (聯俄與反對共產) (Uniting Russia and Opposing Communism). However, this particular work in CW has apparently undergone some "editing" for the benefit of "opposing Russia" in Taiwan. But this does not mean that the editors of CW interpolated Hsü's

works; indeed, the "editing" must have been done by the compiler(s) of Lien O yü ch'ou O wen-t'i t'ao-lun chi (shang) (聯俄與仇俄問題討論集(上)) (Collected Essays on Questions of Uniting Russia and Hating Russia, part I) from which the editors of CW located the article in question; see CW, VI, p. 227.

57. Hsü, "Ch'ou yu ch'ih pai ti ch'ou yu ch'ih pai".

58. Later Marshal Ch'en I, one of the most famous generals of the Chinese Liberation Army. Before his death, he was the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China.

59. Hsü Chih-mo, Lo-yeh, p. 125. The part about Lenin's greatness as acknowledged by Hsü has been removed from CW (most probably by order of the Taiwan authorities), leaving only a few blank lines on the page; see CW, III, 139.

60. CW, III, p. 139. Hsü used the English word "fanatic" in this place.

61. CW, III, p. 140.

62. See Yüeh La, "Ts'ung Ha-erh-pin lai ti ch'i-wen ts'an-wen"; P'eng Ch'ao-hsien, "Lü O hua-ch'iao kuei-kuo tai-piao P'eng Ch'ao-hsien hsien-sheng lai-hsin".

63. See Hu Shih and Hsü Chih-mo, "I-ko t'ai-tu chi an-yü".

64. Ibid.

65. Hsü Chih-mo, "Kuan-yü tang-hua chiao-yü ti t'ao-lun".

66. See Hsü Chih-mo, "Lo Su yu O chi shu hou" and "P'ing Wei-erh-szu chih yu O chi".

67. See CW, III, pp. 509-598.

68. See Hsü's eulogy to Russell's volume in Hsü, "Lo Su yu O chi shu hou", p. 51.

69. Bertrand Russell, The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism, p. 83.

70. See CW, IV, pp. 259-397.

71. CW, I, p. 358.

72. Liang Shih-ch'iu, op. cit. p. 34.

73. See chapter 4, pp. 283-288.

74. See chapter 2, pp. 80-82.

75. Hsü Chih-mo, "T'o-erh-szu-t'ai lun chü i-chieh".

76. See CW, VI, pp. 542-545.

77. CW, VI, p. 480. The idea is most probably from Hardy; see The Collected Poems of Thomas Hardy, p. 530.

78. For instance see CW, II, pp. 155-159, 570-571, 573; III, pp. 120 f., 332-340, 442, 575-579; IV, pp. 528, 495. See also chapter 2, p. 122. Hsü's pantheistic devotion in fact started while he was still a student in Cambridge. His kneeling down facing the setting sun in the open air was analogous to Tieck's and Ping Hsin's respective experiences; see CW, III, p. 261; R. M. Wernaer, Romanticism and the Romantic School in Germany , p. 176; Ping Hsin, Ping Hsin san-wen chi, p. 235.

79. In addition to the six deaths that affected Hsü in the first two years after he returned to China from England (see chapter 2, p.137), there was more grief of this kind assailing him in later years, the dead altogether totalling eight from 1925 to 1931 - his second son Peter; his friend Liu Shu-ho (劉叔和); his associate Lin Ch'ang-min (林長民); an uncle of his, Chiang Chin-chan (蔣謹裥); two younger literary friends, Liu Meng-wei (劉夢葦) and Yang Tzu-hui (楊子惠); his mentor Liang Ch'i-ch'ao; and his mother.

80. CW, VI, p. 109.

81. CW, VI, p. 480.

82. CW, III, pp. 316 f.

83. Chou Tso-jen, Tzu-chi ti yüan-ti, p. 6.

84. CW, III, p. 684.

85. CW, III, p. 687.

86. CW, III, p. 685.

87. CW, III, p. 687.

88. See chapter 4, pp. 279, 285.

89. CW, III, pp. 687 f.

90. CW, III, p. 664.

91. Hsü Chih-mo, "Wo wei-shen-mo lai pan wo hsiang tsen-mo pan".

92. See chapter 2, p. 94.

93. See Lu Hsün, op. cit. XII, p. 110.

94. See the following articles published in CPFK in 1926: Hsü Chih-mo, " 'Hsien-hua' yin ch'u lai ti hsien-hua", "Tsai t'ien chi-chü hsien-hua ti hsien-hua ch'eng-pien wang-hsiang chieh-wei", "Kuan-yü hsia-mien i-shu t'ung-hsin kao tu-che men", "Chieh-shu hsien-hua chieh-shu fei-hua"; Ch'i Ming [Chou Tso-jen] , "Hsien-hua ti hsien-hua chih hsien-hua".

95. Hsü Chih-mo, "Kuan-yü hsia-mien i-shu t'ung-hsin kao tu-che men".

96. Hsü Chih-mo, " 'Hsien-hua' yin ch'u lai ti hsien-hua".

97. See chapter 2, p. 92.

98. See Lu Hsün, op. cit. XII, pp. 70 f.

99. See Lu Hsün, op. cit. XII, p. 36.

100. Hsi Ying [Ch'en Yüan] , op. cit. pp. 338 f.

101. Ch'en Hsi-ying, "Kuan-yü Hsin-yüeh she", p. 25.

102. Tung-fang Hsi, Ch'iu-ch'uang chi, p. 170.

103. See Lu Hsün, op. cit. XI, pp. 11, 171; XII, pp. 17, 21, 36, 54, 57, 66, 69 f., 110, 153; XVII, pp. 63, 74; XVIII, p. 135; XXII, p. 81. Also Lu Hsün hsien-sheng chi-nien wei-yüan hui (ed.), op. cit. I, pp. 173 f; III, p. 173. And also Hsü Kuang-p'ing (ed.), Lu Hsün shu-chien, pp. 198, 673.

104. See CW, VI, p. 376 for Hsü's words about poor translation.

105. The communist view not only prevails in all socialist countries but is influential in many other lands; most writings on Lu Hsün show it. The anti-communist view, in contrast, is very weak indeed; the most typical work of extremity is perhaps Su Hsüeh-lin, Wo lun Lu Hsün.

106. See Hsü's reply attached to a letter by Chou, both of which appeared under the title "Chou Tso-jen hsien-sheng lai-han fu fu".

107. See Hsü Chih-mo, "Kuan-yü hsia-mien i-shu t'ung-hsin kao tu-che men".

108. See CW, I, pp. 71-78, 369.

109. See CW, I, pp. 369-374.

110. As regards details of the similarities named, those which concern Hsü are discussed in different chapters in this thesis. What should be specially noted is that he showed some intolerance later; see chapter 4, p. 290. As for Chou, see the following: Chou Tso-jen, Tzu-chi ti yüan-ti, pp. 5 f., 11 f., 28 f., 64, 67; "Chung-kuo hsi-chü ti san-t'iao lu", M 4; I-shu yü sheng-huo, pp. 82, 96 f., 109, 193, 444; T'an hu chi, p. 128; Chou Tso-jen shu-hsin, pp. 89 f.

111. See Bertrand Russell, Portraits from Memory and Other Essays, p. 36; Autobiography, II, p. 159; see also his "Leisure and Mechanism", p. 117. The latter essay impressed Hsü deeply; his essay "Lo Su yu lai shuo-hua liao" (羅素又來說話了) (Russell Spoke Again) (in CW, VI, pp. 161-174) is a clear echo to the English philosopher's words.

112. Constantine Tung holds the view that Wen I-to was a member of Creation Society whereas Bonnie S. McDougall is of the opinion that Wen had no "close ties with the Society". The fact is: (a) Wen never joined the Society; he had a rather low opinion of its members except Kuo Mo-jo and T'ien Han; (b) He and Kuo were on cordial terms at least up to 1926. See Tung, op. cit. p. 33; McDougall, op. cit. p. 51; Chu Tzu-ch'ing et al (ed.) op. cit. Ting chi (丁集), pp.219-221 and Keng chi (庚集), pp. 26, 74. Line 11 on p. 33

(Keng chi) is rather misleading, but my understanding is that the three names "Kuo Mo-jo, Hsü Chih-mo and Ping Hsin" are an independent group, not grammatically governed by the beginning phrase "Those we do not get in touch with such as ..."

113. For instance see his letters to Liang Shih-ch'iu in Chu Tzu-ch'ing et al (ed.), op. cit. pp. 3-41.

114. This quarterly must not be confused with Ta-chiang pao (大江報) (Great River Daily); information about the latter is given in Chow Tse-tsung, Research Guide to the May Fourth Movement, Intellectual Revolution in Modern China, 1915-24, p. 110, item 493.

115. See Liang Shih-ch'iu, T'an Wen I-to, p. 64.

116. See Liang Shih-ch'iu, Ch'iu-shih tsa-i, pp. 67 f.; Hsiung Fo-hsi, "Tao Wen I-to hsien-sheng", p. 7.

117. See chapter 2, p. 87.

118. See Liang Shih-ch'iu, Ch'iu-shih tsa-i, p. 40; Liang Shih-ch'iu, T'an Wen I-to, p. 8.

119. See Chu Tzu-ch'ing et al (ed.), op. cit. Keng chi (庚集), p. 39; CW, VI, p. 251; Liang Shih-ch'iu, T'an Wen I-to, pp. 71 f.

120. See Chu Tzu-ch'ing et al (ed.), op. cit. Keng chi (庚集) p. 39.

121. See CW, VI, p. 251.

122. CW, VI, p. 254.

123. See CW, VI, p. 258.

124. During this period Hsü adopted two pen-names, i.e., "Ku" (谷) (Valley) and "Nan-hu" (南湖) (South Lake). Others he used after that included "Shan Wo" (删我) (Removing Me); "Hai Ku" (海谷) (Sea Valley); "Ho" (鶴) (Crane); "Hsien Ho" (仙鶴) (Fairy Crane).

125. The Chinese sonnet is Liu Meng-wei's "Ch'i ti ch'ing" (妻底情) (The Love of the Wife), and the English one is Yeh Meng-lin's "A Sonnet", in CPFK, 22nd Apr. and 13th May, 1926 respectively.

126. Wen I-to, "Shih ti ke-lü".

127. Ibid.

128. Jao Meng-k'an, "Hsin-shih ti yin-chieh".

129. Wen I-to, op. cit. In Howard L. Boorman (ed.), Biographical Dictionary of Republican China, II, p. 124 these three "beauties" are erroneously attributed to Hsü Chih-mo; in fact they are all Wen's inventions. Unfortunately, under Wen I-to in the same book (III, pp. 408-411), these three "beauties" are not mentioned at all.

130. CW, VI, pp. 260 f. The term "internal rhythm" is in English in the text.

131. See Jao Meng-k'an, op. cit.

132. See CW, VI, p. 110.

133. See CW, VI, pp. 260 f.

134. Jao Meng-k'an, op. cit.

135. See Wen's comments on the T'ang poet Li Po's verse in Chu Tzu-ch'ing et al (ed.), op. cit. Ping chi (丙集), p. 158; Wen I-to, op. cit.

136. Wen I-to, op. cit.

137. CW, VI, p. 260.

138. See CW, VI, p. 261.

139. Wang Yao, Chung-kuo hsin wen-hsüeh shih kao , p. 75.

140. Chu Tzu-ch'ing, Hsin-shih tsa-hua, p. 68.

141. Ibid. p. 98.

142. See CW, I, p. 618 and Chu Tzu-ch'ing, Hsin-shih tsa-hua, p. 97.

143. Liu Shou-sung, Chung-kuo hsin wen-hsüeh shih ch'u-kao, part I, p. 159; see also Shih Ling, "Hsin-yüeh shih-p'ai", p. 130.

144. See T'an Tzu-hao's comments in Su Hsüeh-lin, Wen-t'an hua-chiu, p. 161.

145. It may well be pointed out that those who advocate ke-lü (格律) (regularity) in present-day China base their argument essentially, with some modification of course, on Wen I-to's theory and practice. See Ho Ch'i-fang, Wen-hsüeh i-shu ti ch'un-t'ien, "Tsai lun shih-ko hsing-shih wen-t'i", pp. 55-75; Hsü Ch'ih, "T'an ke-lü shih", pp. 90 f.; Tung Ch'u-p'ing, "Ts'ung Wen I-to 'Szu-shui' t'an tao ke-lü shih wen-t'i", pp. 74-84.

146. Liu Wu-chi and Li T'ien-yi in their Readings in Contemporary Chinese Literature (p. xxx) offer the opinion that all the poets whose works appear in Hsin-shih k'u (新詩庫) (The Treasury of New Poetry) are influenced by Hsü. While this seems a little going too far, it is true that Hsü does enjoy, as Cyril Birch says,"a huge contemporary popularity" (Birch, "English and Chinese Metres in Hsü Chih-mo", p. 290); see also Harold Acton and Ch'en Shih-hsiang, op. cit. p. 22.
The Treasury of New Poetry, edited and compiled by Shao Hsün-mei, is a series of modern Chinese pai-hua verse by such persons as Fang Wei-te (方瑋德), Liang Tsung-tai (梁宗岱), Ch'en Meng-chia (陳夢家), Chin K'e-mu (金克木), Shao Hsün-mei (邵洵美), Chu Hsiang (朱湘), Lo Nien-sheng (羅念生), Tai Wang-shu (戴望舒), Hou Ju-hua (侯汝華), Hsü Ch'ih (徐遲), et al. I have never seen any of the volumes; there is an advertisement about them in Jen-yen chou-k'an (人言周刊), II: 50, 1936. As far as I know, the only article that gives some detail of this series is Zau Sinmay [Shao Hsün-mei], "Poetry Chronicle", pp. 24-29.

147. This was first pointed out in Cyril Birch, "English and Chinese Metres in Hsü Chih-mo", p. 279.

148. But even Wen I-to did not always stick to those strict rules formed by himself. His later poems showed considerable flexibility and the uniformity in "Dead Water" was largely abandoned, his last poem "Ch'i-chi" (奇蹟) (Miracle) being a good example.

149. The following articles are wholly or partly criticism of the older poets like Hu Shih, K'ang Pai-ch'ing, Kuo Mo-jo, et al: Chu Hsiang, "Hsin-shih p'ing";

Wen I-to, op. cit.; Jao Meng-k'an, "Kan-shang chu-i yü Ch'uang-tsao she".

150. On 18th Mar. 1926 demonstrators were fired on by troops of the Peking government. Many young students died.

151. Hsü was by no means in sympathy with the government. He felt as deeply as others, but he seemed to be inclined to hold everybody responsible for the "abnormal society" of China; see CW, III, p. 395. The poem in question is "Mei hsüeh cheng ch'un" (梅雪爭春) (The Contest for Beauty in Spring between Plum Blossoms and Snow)

152. This "nationalist" does not mean Kuomintang but "kuo-chia chu-i che" (國家主義者) (a believer in nationalism).

153. Shen at that time used the pen-name "Hsiao Ping" (小兵) (Little Soldier), perhaps being aware of his own youth and insignificance.

154. Chu Tzu-ch'ing et al (ed.) op. cit, Keng chi (庚集), p. 39.

155. Liang Shih-ch'iu, T'an Wen I-to, p. 72.

156. CW, VI, p. 258.

157. The sonnet is in Chu Hsiang, Shih-men chi, p. 129.

158. Howard L. Boorman (ed.), op. cit. II, p. 122.

159. See CW, VI, p. 258.

160. See Chu Tzu-ch'ing et al (ed.), op. cit. Keng chi (庚集) p. 41.

161. According to CW, I, 614, Hsü was the "chu-pien" (主編) (editor-in-chief) and Wen, "pien-chi" (編輯) (editor). This seems to imply that Hsü was nominally in charge, but Wen was the responsible person. Page 615 gives the information that the first editorial article by Hsü "was a manifesto of the new poetry movement which Hsü announced to the world on behalf of the people of the Crescent Moon Society". This is inaccurate since the group of poets except for Hsü himself were not associated with the Society.

162. Report by Tsang K'e-chia in his Mo pu tiao ti ying-hsiang, p. 7; see also Shih Ching, Wen I-to ti tao-lu, p. 24.

163. See Liang Shih-ch'iu, T'an Wen I-to, pp. 56, 87.

164. It may seem an exception when Wen included twelve poems of Hsü's in his "Hsien-tai shih ch'ao" (現代詩鈔) (Selected Modern Verse). I would think that Wen's selection of Hsü's and others' works was made on the basis of the popularity of the poets concerned since those selected poems were supposed to be ultimately translated and published for the English-speaking readers. See Chu Tzu-ch'ing et al (ed.), op. cit. Hsin chi (辛集) pp. 453-669 and Keng chi (庚集) p. 54.

165. CW, II, p. 345.

166. For Wen's distrust of the so-called inspiration see a letter of his written in 1928 in Chu Tzu-ch'ing et al (ed.), op. cit. Keng chi (庚集) p. 43 and Ting chi (丁集) p. 168. The latter reference shows Wen's serious attitude towards verse-making. See also Wen's comments on the T'ang poet Li Po's verse in the same book Ping chi (丙集), p. 158.

167. See ibid. Ting chi (丁集) p. 143 and Keng chi (庚集) pp. 20 f.; Tsang K'e-chia, "Hai", p. 538.

168. Shih Ching, op. cit. p. 56.

169. See CW, VI, p. 262.

170. That anthology was published in Shanghai in 1931. It must be noted that Ch'en Meng-chia, though once Wen's student, was a disciple of Hsü in poetry. When he wrote about the poets' discussion group taking place in 1926, he rated high Hsü's position by giving the misinformation that it was Hsü who invited Wen, Jao and others to the discussion and thus initiated the Poetry Magazine; see CW, I, p. 447.

171. Both the anthology and The Tiger were published by the Crescent Moon Book Co., Shanghai, the former in September, 1931 and the latter, a month earlier.

172. See Tsang K'e-chia, "Hai", p. 538.

173. See Chu Tzu-ch'ing et al (ed.), Keng chi (庚集) p. 33.
Mrs. Sarojini Naidu (1879-1949) was educated in India and England. An educationalist and a leader of the political movement for the freedom of India, she wrote poetry, and was known as the "Nightingale of India".

174. CW, VI, p. 266. In connection with the Drama Magazine, there was a grand project called "Chinese Drama Movement" proposed by Hsü's literary friends, but nothing significant came out of it.

175. See CPFK, 17th June and 23rd Sept. 1926. The date of the close of the Magazine given in CW, VI, pp. 267, 272 and 276 is wrong, but is correct in CW, I, p. 621.

176. See CW, VI, p. 270.

177. Yü Shang-yüan, "I-ko pan p'o ti meng". The quotation from Chao Ts'ung in CW, I, p. 620 is not entirely accurate. Yü Shang-yüan, however, was not completely disillusioned; see CW, VI, p. 275.

178. CW,VI, p. 267. The last few dots in the quotations are Hsü's,obviously employed to convey his earnestness.

179. Namely, Hsü, "T'o-erh-szu-t'ai lun chü i-chieh".

180. See CW, VI, p. 270.

181. Ibid.

182. See CW, VI, P. 270.

183. See CW, VI, p. 272.

184. See note No. 178 of this chapter.

185. See CW, I, pp. 623 f.

186. See Ch'ü Chü-nung's announcement in CPFK, 30th May, 1927.

187. See chapter 4, pp. 279 ff.

188. CW, II, p. 345.

189. See CW, IV, pp. 249, 252, 419.

190. See CW, IV, pp. 431 f.

191. See CW, IV, pp. 447 f., 457, 459 f.

192. See CW, IV, p. 397.

193. See CW, IV, p. 505; III, p. 576. Hsü praised the Brownings again later in 1928; see CW, VI, pp. 321-349.

194. "Lines" was not included in any of Hsü's collections; details of its publication given in "Bibliography".

195. See CW, IV, pp. 394, 450.

196. See Giuliano Bertuccioli, " 'Una Notte a Firenze' di Hsü Chih-mo", pp. 99-102; Leo Ou-fan Lee, op. cit. pp. 325-327.

197. For lines 17 f. see CW, IV, pp. 402, 418, 462; for line 57 see CW, IV, p. 465; for line 61 see CW, IV, pp. 425 f; for the last line see CW, IV, p. 360. Some general idea of the background of this poem can be gleaned from CW, IV, pp. 356-358.

198. See CW, IV, p. 356.

199. See CW, IV, p. 393.

200. See CW, IV, pp. 411 f.

201. See CW, IV, p. 420. It is my understanding that Lu Hsiao-man's words "the old path" and "your first love" refer to nobody else but Lin Hui-yin. Lu Hsiao-man's knowledge of Hsü's previous affair is also confirmed on page 409.

202. CW, IV, p. 460.

203. CW, IV, p. 465.

204. Hsü received the telegram probably on 14th July and left England for home the next day (see Hsü's letter to L. K. Elmhirst dated 13th July, 1925). This needs some explanation: According to Hsiao-man's diary, the telegram was despatched not earlier than 14th noon (see CW, IV, pp. 454 f.); in this connection Hsü could not have received it on 13th. Granted that he got the message on 14th,

the date of his letter to Elmhirst would be wrong - it should be 14th. It may be added that Hsü, as a rule, was not very accurate in his dates.

205. See this chapter, p. 183.

206. Actually Lu Hsiao-man was not ill on the day she sent the telegram. What prompted her to urge Hsü to return was the news about Hsü's "wild" life in Paris; see CW, IV, pp. 454 f.

207. See CW, I, p. 603; II, p. 209, 2nd stanza; IV, pp. 269, 273, 277. It is also true that sometimes they did not have the opportunity to exchange even a word when other people were present (see CW, IV, p. 253).

208. See CW, IV, p. 306.

209. See CW, IV, p. 326.

210. CW, IV, p. 298.

211. CW, IV, p. 253.

212. See CW, I, p. 631.

213. CW, IV, pp. 347 f.

214. CW, III, p. 396.

215. CW, III, pp. 391-403.

216. CW, III, pp. 411-413.

217. See Tsang K'e-chia (ed.), Chung-kuo hsin-shih hsüan, 1919-1949.

218. See CW, III, p. 24.

219. Ch'ien Hsing-ch'un sees nothing but "some 'humanitarian' sentiment" in the poem; see his "Chung-kuo hsin-hsing wen-hsüeh lun", p. 158.

220. The most typical poem conveying all these virtues is "Ai ti ling-kan" (愛的靈感) (The Inspiration of Love) in the third collection.

221. See for instance CW, III, pp. 288 f., 368-370, 440.

222. CW, III, p. 396.

223. See Kuo's works written after 1924 in his Mo-jo wen-chi, I.

224. What seems to me a particular reference to Lin Hui-yin is the 4th stanza; undoubtedly, in Hsü's life, the reeds always remind him of her; see CW, IV, pp. 511 f.

225. Hsü's essay "Hsiang fei" (想飛) (Wanting to Fly) is always considered exceptionally prophetic of his death, too (see CW, III, pp. 425-433, especially p. 433).

226. See CW, II, p. 347.

227. The quotation, part of a letter from Ping Hsin to Liang Shih-ch'iu, is cited in Liang, "I Ping Hsin", p. 13.

228. The poem appears in CPFK but is not included in any of Hsü's collections.

229. See CW, I, p. 77; III, pp. 129, 368, 370 f., 374.

230. CW, III, p. 129.

231. CW, III, p. 130.

232. J. Middleton Murry, "Keats's Thought: A Discovery of Truth", p. 374.

233. See CW, III, pp. 288 f., 368-370, 440.

234. CW, III, p. 441.

235. See Yeh Ch'ing, "Hsü Chih-mo lun", p. 70. Needless to say, this critique must not be confused with Mao Tun's of the same title.

236. See Thomas Hardy, op. cit. p. 543.

237. See CW, II, p. 344.

238. See this chapter, p. 214.

239. For comparison see CW, II, pp. 204 f., 209-218, 232-239, and Thomas Hardy, op. cit. pp. 567, 590, 612, 628 f., 635, 646.

240. Neither "lilt" nor "rhythm" will give the full connotation of the original as conveyed in Jao Meng-k'an's article; see the latter part of the paragraph.

241. See Jao Meng-k'an, op. cit. and Wen I-to, op. cit.

242. See Jao Meng-k'an, op. cit.

243. See CW, VI, pp. 260 f.

244. Cyril Birch sees English metrical forms in a number of Hsü's poems. His scansion, however, seems arbitrary to me. For example, if Hsü had really tried to adopt the metre of "La Belle Dame sans Merci" in his "Lo-yeh hsiao ch'ang" (落葉小唱) (A Song of Dead Leaves), he would have had no difficulty in conforming to the iambic tetrameter and dimeter of Keats throughout and could have written the first stanza somewhat like the following:

一陣聲響轉上階沿，
(我正挨近着夢鄉邊)，
這準是她脚步，我想——
在這深夜。

See Cyril Birch, "English and Chinese Metres in Hsü Chih-mo". Marcela Štolzova-Boušková's scansion of Ping Hsin's verse is in principle the same as Birch's, but less convincing. If such scansion were accepted as legitimate, even Chinese classical poetry could be treated as iambic, trochaic, anapaestic, dactylic, etc. See Štolzova-Boušková, "On the Origin of Modern Chinese Prosody: An Analysis of the Prosodic Components in the Words of Ping Hsin (1)", 619-643.

Yeh Kung-ch'ao told me in an interview in Feb. 1971 that Hsü's poems were not written in any English metres but were based on Chinese phrasal units.

245. CW, VI, pp. 260 f.

246. The saying, of Orphic origin, is quoted in P. F. Baum (ed.), The Centennial Edition of the Works of Sidney Lanier, II, p. 195. Lanier, who sees nothing but music in poetry, may have had some influence on Hsü; see CW, IV, p. 496.

247. See this chapter, p. 213.

248. See CW, VI, p. 309.

249. Lu Chih-wei, afterwards president of Yen-ching University, was the first man to try to adopt the English stress system in Chinese pai-hua verse. His experiment can be seen in his Tu-ho (渡河) (Crossing the River) (published in Shanghai, 1923) which was considered a failure by all including himself. Hsü Chih-mo and Hu Shih wished to write a review on it but never did; see CW, IV, p. 494.

250. See CW, II, pp. 233 f., 236, 304 f.

251. See Chu Hsiang, op. cit. pp. 9 f., CW, VI, pp. 230 f.

252. For "cockney rhyme" see Robert Graves, The Common Asphodel, p. 4.

253. See Louis MacNeice, Modern Poetry , p. 132.

254. Hsü Kuang-p'ing (ed.), op. cit. p. 889.

255. Mao Tun, "Hsü Chih-mo lun", p. 522.

256. CW, VI, p. 309.

257. Hsü in a postscript to [Chung] T'ien-hsin's letter of 7th May, 1926 made it clear that his attitude towards pai-hua regulated verse was "not pessimistic, though ... by no means absolutely or even relatively optimistic". The postscript was attached to T'ien-hsin, "Sui-pien t'an-t'an i shih yü tso shih".

258. See CW, II, pp. 204, 210, 229, 297.

259. See CW, II, p. 325.

260. See lines 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 11, 12 in the poem.

261. See Wen I-to, op. cit.

262. See CW, II, pp. 252, 272, 252, 237, 227, 253.

263. For instance see CW, II, pp. 189, 201, 207-209, 245, 254, 293, 299, 304, 315, 323.

264. Cyril Birch's opinion is different; see Birch, op. cit. p. 269.

265. Hsü Chih-mo, "Art and Life", p. 14.

266. See CW, III, pp. 319-331

267. CW, III, p. 324.

268. Yü Ta-fu wrote about Hsü's "busy life" during the day time in his "Wu shih mang che hsien-t'an". As for Hsü's writing his poems, essays, etc. at night, we can find a clue to it at the end of some of his writings which close with words like "done at mid-night" in an extra line; for instance see CW, II, p. 436 and III, p. 331.

CHAPTER FOUR

A. Married life and troubles.

1. First phase.

We have already seen how Hsü Chih-mo, after his victory in love, soon found himself incapable of literary composition especially writing poetry. The diagnosis of his own "illness" Hsü attempted could not satisfy even himself, as mentioned in last chapter. It is hoped that the following paragraphs can provide an answer for this important matter.

After Lu Hsiao-man had divorced her husband, she lived together with Hsü in Peking.(1) During the early part of this period, happiness reigned day and night in their life, and Hsü was simply too powerfully overwhelmed by success and joy to write.(2) What engages our attention is that after the first few months of white-heat passion and heavenly bliss, his creative drive did not appear to have returned. He wrote, but wrote little, and with great difficulty.(3)

Then more months elapsed. When their marriage was over, Hsü optimistically drafted plans for creative writing as well as translation and convinced himself that a personal renaissance was to come.(4) The attempt, however, brought about hardly any positive results. Evidence has it that Hsü's parents were against his second marriage and did not finance it, and consequently he was already in debt even before the wedding took place on 3rd October, 1926.(5) The awkward situation did not improve at all after that date since Hsiao-man was extremely extravagant and, owing to the kind of irregular life she led, her health suffered;(6) as a consequence, the doctor's bill was considerable. Hsü Chih-mo

had never before been harassed by money problems, but now financial difficulty to him was an everyday reality.

When Hsü took Hsiao-man back to his native town in order to live with his parents, he, in addition to a well-intentioned desire of a Chinese son acting in the traditional way to please his father and mother, must have anticipated (a) a quiet country life to "domesticate" his bride and to inspire his literary work and (b) the assurance of free "food and lodgings" from his parents. Unfortunately, Hsiao-man was not a conventional type of daughter-in-law; her actions followed her own whims rather than the age-old unwritten code of deference to her parents-in-law. An emotional bomb exploded! The old couple soon hurried to Peking to live with Hsü's first wife who by that time had already returned to China from Germany. Then civil war threatened Hsia-shih. To Hsü's dismay, he could not tap his father's account even for a cent because of the old man's strict instructions to his bankers before leaving for the north. Painfully embarrassed, Hsü had to solicit a loan from one of his uncles before he and Hsiao-man could make their escape to Shanghai.(7)

The refugees's life in the "oriental New York" proved rather sad and depressing, but Hsiao-man was not the kind of woman to practise economy. She sought after all kinds of entertainments and worst of all, she often got Hsü involved in her gay life, however reluctant he was. The entry in Hsü's diary on 27th December, 1926 was revealing: when he desired to enjoy carol singing in a church, apparently wishing to refresh his weary soul, he was compelled by Hsiao-man to take part in a Chinese opera (which Hsü called "rotten play") and in dancing in a commercial ball-room.(8) Debts, Hsiao-man's life,

Hsiao-man's health, small lodgings, noisy traffic, tall buildings, commercialism here, there and everywhere ... all disgusted him but none was to be shaken off. Creative writing must be a kind of dystocia under such conditions.

Hsü must have questioned the love between himself and Hsiao-man. Rationalizing, he reached the conclusion that Love demanded "patience and sacrifice".(9) He dared not make plans, and could only entertain wishful thoughts like "May the old boredom die; may new hopes be born", or make a feeble supplication: "Give me courage; give me strength. Heaven!"(10) But the question "Could there be any new hope in life?" must have occurred to him more than once.(11)

Some more extracts from his diary vividly illustrate his feelings in early 1927:

> The starting point of love is not necessarily the body, but love reaches its summit in the body. The starting point of repugnance is not necessarily the body either, but it reaches its summit in the body as well.
>
> .....
>
> The past is a heap of ashes, thoroughly burnt, not a word left.
>
> My only attraction is Buddha. He is much greater than I; I fear him.
>
> .....
>
> Terribly bored; finishing three glasses of brandy.
>
> .....
>
> Time was spent in boredom. Meaningless; cold; the same everywhere.(12)

In addition to straightened circumstances, the seemingly irrevocable displeasure of his father, who previously was so affectionate towards him, must have weighed down heavily on him. The love he had fought for and finally won was now fading, and the deep parental affection he had enjoyed since his childhood now seemed to be dying away.

Mao Tun commenting on Hsü's literary stagnation[13] affirmed that it was primarily due to Hsü's failure in grasping the reality of the "great [political and] social upheaval" taking place in China; he also stressed Hsü's loss of hope over democracy in China.[14] Mao Tun seemed to be too much occupied with his socialist doctrine to look into Hsü's life, and he ignored, or was ignorant of, the fact that Hsü's most productive period was 1923-26 when China was no better than the China in 1927 and 1928. Hsü's inertness had a little to do with China's "upheaval" of course; his moving to Shanghai is evidence of his being affected by the civil war, but his inertness was chiefly an individual matter. Presumably, even if there had been a parliament of the British type set up in China, his troubles would not have been significantly alleviated as long as he had to live with and provide for his "naughty cat" (Hsiao-man). Indeed, one can legitimately doubt how long Hsü could have led a secluded life in his native place after his second marriage even if there had not been the civil war. Hsiao-man was not to be weaned from the glamour and gaiety of big cities. She was not Jane Austen who could lead a quiet life and write things to pass her time. Hsiao-man's occasional yearning for nature before marrying Hsü was not her real self,[15] that could only be fully gratified by Shanghai, and that is why she refused to follow Hsü back to Peking in 1931

and why Hsü had to commune between Peking and Shanghai regularly like a salesman and eventually met his death in an air crash. What a difference it would have been for herself and her husband and in the broad sense for modern Chinese literature if she had settled at once with Hsü in the good old northern city after Hsü had accepted an appointment at Peking University! It sounds harsh, but there is truth in asserting that Hsiao-man is a, if not the, cause of Hsü's untimely death.

Hsü's own explanation given in later days of his literary torpor was condensed into a simple phrase: "city life". This meant nothing or many things. Among friends, he added the word "poverty".(16) Hsiao-man, however, at least admitted after her husband's death that it was she who killed his inspiration for both poetical and other literary writings though she imputed everything to her own poor health.(17)

The whole picture of Hsü's life reveals the fact that he was careful to conceal the main cause of his troubles and frustration in all his writings, correspondence and even diary. He dared not blame Hsiao-man openly. When he proposed to divorce his first wife years before, his reason was to fight a social evil - arranged marriage. When he referred to his sad plight in his last years with regard to literary unproductivity, he pointed his fingers only at some secondary causes. In both cases he did not expose to the world his innermost feelings. He was anxious to save his own face and maintain a noble image, and so he had to pay the price - undergoing sufferings. As for remedy, there was none, with the possible exception of oblivion to be derived from work. In this consideration his very busy life afterwards served a double purpose - for money (that went to Hsiao-man), and for forgetfulness

(that helped him to suffer more comfortably).

2. Second phase.

But the heaviest blow to Hsü Chih-mo came from another direction. Beginning from 1927 or a little later, he witnessed the slow death of his ideal. The pain was aggravated by the fact thst he had to bear the self-afflicted cross of remorse alone. To elucidate this crucial point, we ought to, first of all, examine his ideal closely. We must refresh our memory that Hsü was liang Ch'i-ch'ao's disciple and was in the beginning of his university years fervently bent on becoming a Chinese Alexander Hamilton. When he abandoned his political aspirations for a literary career, it was not an abandonment of his mission or sense of mission in life but only a change of goal. A noble goal remained all the same. The divorce of his first wife marked his triumph over arranged marriage, but this was not the positive end in his life. "To break new ground in art and literature" was yet to be realized.(18)

Hsü read Edward Dowden's The Life of Browning in 1923 and was tremendously impressed by the love story and the literary life of the Brownings.(19) We may safely say that he did dream of that kind of life. Lin Hui-yin might have helped him to it if she had condescended to do so, but she eventually turned out to be only a tantalizing mirage to him. Then Hsü fastened his hope on Lu Hsiao-man.(20)

Hsü's diary and letters to Lu Hsiao-man yield ample evidence of his conviction of her immense literary

potentialities and of his own ability for realizing them.[21] He was not unaware of her fondness for entertainments, social functions and vanity before their marriage, but he believed, or Hsiao-man made him believe, that it was merely a form of escapism fostered under unhappy circumstances, and could be corrected easily.[22] How Hsü wished himself and Hsiao-man, as a pair of Chinese Brownings, to shine in modern Chinese history not only by their noble love but by their literary achievements! A passage from Hsü's diary, which is better considered as a letter to Hsiao-man, provides the most meaningful illustration of this point:

> The world is not devoid of love which, however, is mostly impure and defective; that is not worth anything and is trivial and shallow. We are people of high minds and must not slacken in the least. We must set an upright, genuine example ... We now have a small number of friends who as far as intellectual excellence is concerned are the élite in China. They love us genuinely, rate us highly and expect a great deal from us. They are anxious to see us achieve something beyond the attainment of average men and realize the world which ordinary people can only dream of. They, I am confident, believe you and I have the necessary natural endowments and abilities ... So for ourselves, for our friends, for society, for Heaven, we shoulder a responsibility that requires us to struggle to the end - for absolute perfection![23]

Indeed, Hsü was all eagerness to "draw a higher waterline in the history of human evolution"[24] as he thought the Brownings had done with great success. That was Hsü's ideal, which was not so abstract as "love, freedom and beauty", and its content exceeded the simple wish of "free union with a beautiful woman".[25] Although it was

not entirely lacking in social implications, since he had "society" and "Heaven" in mind and furthermore, literary achievement could hardly be completely divorced from society, Hsü's ideal was by and large the product of individualism, or individual heroism as socialist critics would prefer to call it. In the broad sense we may say Hsü had many ideals, as all human beings do, for example, political ideals, social ideals, educational ideals, etc., but they were all subordinate. Truly, if he had succeeded in moulding Hsiao-man to his desired standard, he could have posed himself and her as an ideal couple to "set a classic example for crippled mankind",(26) and could have convinced the world of the soundness of his idealism, hence the fulfilment of his mission in life and the enhancement of his image.

But it was a disastrous fact that Hsü's estimate of Hsiao-man was only a lover's illusion. Although Hsiao-man was indeed clever and versatile, being able to speak English and French, to sing, act, paint and write, the sad thing was that she could never make up her mind to be serious in any worthy intellectual or artistic pursuit.(27) Her talent did not make her an Elizabeth Browning, and her versatility was merely a curse, for she was more of an expert than most at squandering money in the ball-room, in the theatre, on opium, on patronizing actors and actresses, and so forth and so on.(28) With such a wife, the husband's first consideration was presumably not writing poetry but making money. How Hsü loathed it! But there was no return. Hsiao-man was his "achievement of a whole life" and "more precious than paradise" as he thought her to be after their engagement;(29) and indeed, she would never have imagined divorcing Wang Keng if it had not been for Hsü's seduction. Everything, good or bad, was in the

final analysis the fruit from the seed Hsü sowed. Therefore as a good husband and a noble soul responsible for his own actions, he taught at three universities beginning from 1928. The next year, he dropped one, but concurrently worked as an editor in Chung-hua shu-chü (中華書局), one of the most famous publishing houses in China.(30) Hsü's energy was amazing; his thirst for money seemed insatiable; his life, however, deserved sympathy. His monthly income was reputed to be about a thousand Chinese dollars in the aggregate, but he sometimes still found it hard to make both ends meet, for Hsiao-man's expenditure was alarming. To avoid getting into debt, he learned to be extremely economical.(31) All this, albeit not common knowledge to the outside world, was plain to most of his friends.

Added to literary unproductivity and the death of ideal was Hsiao-man's loose conduct which gradually got on his nerves. Whether she was unfaithful to him is hard to say, but she obviously maintained very close relations with an actor called Weng Jui-wu (翁瑞午). Incidentally, Hsiao-man after Hsü's death became a "merry widow" as she had promised herself and set up house with Weng, still carrying on the same kind of life after her sorrow for Hsü had subsided.(32)

During the period from his resigning the editorship of the Crescent Moon Monthly in the summer of 1929 to the autumn of 1930, Hsü must have experienced a kind of hell on earth in his life. He found himself failing in both family life and literary life. He was disappointed by both Hsiao-man and his literary associates,(33) and yet he could hardly make open complaints since, in Hsiao-man's case, it was after all his own blunder that caused his own misery; and in the

other case, since he had lost his parents' affection and watched the gradual fading of conjugal happiness between him and Hsiao-man, he could not afford to break or even impair any friendship that could still yield a little warmth and comfort. We can well imagine how heavy his mental burden was. Devastated, as it were, by a psychological earthquake, his inner being was all cracks and caverns. He was virtually on the verge of nervous break-down and demoralization.

Probably by this time Hsü saw Ping Hsin for the last time, and made the following grievous utterance in her presence: "My heart and all my organs have been ruined; I have to go to your holy abode to repent."(34)

Hsü's case was curiously analogous to his "hero" Thomas Hardy's. Carl J. Weber's remarks concerning Hardy in this respect can well be used for description of Hsü: "He did not retaliate on his wife. He preferred to 'ache deeply' but make no moans; smile out, but stilly suffer."(35)

In addition to the private confession to Ping Hsin, the careful reader can see Hsü's pain and suffering in his works. In the preface of The Tiger, he owned that his life had "practically dried up"; he experienced "many troubles"; and he had chosen "a wrong path" in life.(36) He was conscious of the silent reproach and audible sympathy from those who were cognizant of his family life; he made the following plea:

> ... I still want to make some noise under the various burdens of practical life.
>
> Don't reproach me too severely. I feel I have already had blood all over my head ...(37)

Fortunately among his students in the Central University of Nanking there were two, i.e., Ch'en Meng-chia and Fang Wei-teh (方瑋德) who were so keen on poetry that their young zeal fired and regenerated Hsü's "withering heart for poetry";[38] and with their and a few other friends' support, he resurrected the Poetry Magazine which originally appeared in Peking Morning Post in 1926. This particular activity, which was a fulfilment of his ambition expressed in a letter of his to Li Ch'i (李祁) about two years before,[39] instilled new life into him. His poetic inspiration returned, and he was thus miraculously saved from sinking into utter despair. He wrote in the preface of his third collection The Tiger: "I hope this is a real chance for me to revive."[40] And indeed everything pointed to a second high tide of his creative life. But death soon darkened the scene. He died a few months after these encouraging words had been uttered.

B. The Crescent Moon Monthly.

Fighting between warlords was still going on in the first part of 1926 in China. Large-scale civil war threatened the country after the Nationalists in the south had launched the Northern Expedition in July. But many intellectuals who earned their living primarily by teaching in Peking were worried not so much by the prospects of civil war as by the uncertainty of payment of their salaries owing to the Government's financial troubles.(41) Those who had a place to go, therefore, left the capital. Shanghai became the refuge, temporary at least, for most of them in terms of both jobs and safety, thanks to the existence of several concessions controlled by the "foreign devils".

Hsü and his old friends like Hu Shih, Wen I-to, Jao Meng-k'an, Liang Shih-ch'iu et al came to Shanghai at various times during this period. They opened the Crescent Moon Book Company and Hsü himself with a couple of friends also ran a dress company.(42) All this helped in some measure to kill his boredom at home. Besides, he obtained a teaching post shortly after he arrived in Shanghai, "earning a little money to live on" as he told his English friend L. K. Elmhirst.(43)

On the New Year's day of 1927, Hsü decided to publish a magazine.(44) He won support from Hu Shih and some other friends such as Liang Shih-ch'iu, Wen I-to, Jao Meng-k'an, Yü Shang-yüan, Yeh Kung-ch'ao (葉公超, better known as George Yeh in the west), Chang Yü-chiu, Liu Ying-shih (劉英士) and others.(45) He was too enthusiastic to follow the normal procedure in organizing the preparation work, and even in the beginning this group of people were not quite unanimous in everything.

The christening of the magazine by Hsü alone was not approved without some grumbling and Hsü's self-appointment as editor-in-chief incurred displeasure from some of them.(46) Whether Hsü's was an expression of "will to power" is open for debate, but it seems that he was confident of himself as an editor after his experience on the Peking Morning Post. Nevertheless, Hsü soon sensed his associates' feelings and finally an editorial board of six, i.e., Liang Shih-ch'iu, Wen I-to, Jao Meng-k'an, Yeh Kung-ch'ao, P'an Kuang-tan (潘光旦, also known as Quentin Pan) and Hsü himself, was created.(47) The first issue of Crescent Moon Monthly appeared in print on 10th March, 1928.(48) Its anonymous leading article "Hsin-yüeh ti t'ai-tu" (新月的態度) (The Attitude of the Crescent Moon) which was supposed to be a collective manifesto representative of the views of all the Crescent Moon people was in fact written by Hsü and in the main reflected his personal attitude towards and proposal for the development of modern Chinese literature. In his survey of the Chinese literary scene he was convinced of the darkness of the age and the devilishness pervading the different literary trends.(49) He authoritatively proclaimed that they must not be tolerated and ought to be eradicated - a sentiment contrary to his tolerant disposition. On the constructive side, he upheld two principles, namely, health and dignity which were thought to be the mother of rational thought and creative energy.

Although extremely specific about what was negative, Hsü was very guarded about what was positive. He set forth "creative idealism" on which he did not elaborate. The explanation of this general weakness in and apparent unbalance of argument may have been due to the unanimous condemnation of the leftist literary

movement by the Crescent Moon people on the one hand and their differences on a detailed positive programme on the other. Certainly, Hsü's romanticism, Liang Shih-ch'iu's neo-humanism, Hu Shih's pragmatism and Yeh Kung-ch'ao's modernism could hardly be presented together in a common "-ism" with a clear-cut destination and goal. Even the vague "creative idealism" may not have pleased every Crescemt Moon individual. Elaboration of it was naturally ruled out.(50)

In "The Attitude of the Crescent Moon" Hsü emphasized life as against art for art's sake and decadence; reason as against uncontrolled emotion; and love as against hate. Both the first and the last points were not new in him; what interests us is the second point which marked a change of attitude towards emotion. By 1928 he seemed to have learned that uncontrolled emotion was beneficial neither to individuals nor to mankind as a whole. He appeared to have renounced his adherence to the theory and practice of romantic expansiveness. Indeed, he stressed this point in another article in the same issue of the monthly saying: "Emotion must be considerably controlled and regulated by reason."(51) Was Hsü influenced by Irving Babbitt through Liang Shih-ch'iu? We shall examine this later;(52) but the fact that he through experience in married life had learned a good lesson and acquired a degree of wisdom seemed to be quite certain.

In "The Attitude of the Crescent Moon" Hsü's ideological arch-foe, or "the devil" in his words, was the left-wing writers who, as a power in the realm of thought, was mighty and gained more and more ground from day to day among the educated Chinese, especially those of the younger generation.

Reaction to Hsü's article from the leftists was immediate and sharp. Those who policed the field of modern Chinese literature simply could not tolerate an upstart literary gendarme. P'eng K'ang (彭康) of the Creation Society brandishing his Marxism denounced every point raised in "The Attitude of the Crescent Moon" in his forcible critique: "Shen-mo shih 'chien-k'ang yü tsun-yen?' " (甚麼是'健康與尊嚴'?) (What Is 'Health and Dignity'?)(53) But Hsü was not keen on polemics and turned a deaf ear to attacks; nod did he take part in the subsequent "pen-war" between Liang Shih-ch'iu and Lu Hsün over translation, proletarian literature, etc.(54)

Although Hsü emphasized the word szu-hsiang (思想) (thought) in his article, he evidently did not make the monthly a magazine of "thoughts". The Crescent Moon Monthly under his editorship was essentially a literary magazine, and he was apparently determined to keep it as such indefinitely. However, the "power struggle" behind the velvet curtain of the Crescent Moon in the next summer was on, resulting in Hsü's "downfall". A letter to his former student Li Ch'i revealed most of the fact hitherto unknown to the outside world:

> My editing the Crescent Moon has long been dissatisfactory to my colleagues ... The story 'Kuan-yin hua'(55) which I selected for No. 2, vol. I was appreciated by quite a number of readers ... but Liang Shih-ch'iu held a different opinion, saying it violated the principle of the magazine, and Shih-chih [Hu Shih] also seemed to support him. That was one thing. Your 'Chao X-kuang shih'(56) and translation were also assigned for the second issue by me. Mr. Liang again opposed [my decision] ... Mr. Hu also commented that 'Chao X-kuang shih" was unintelligible; but I didn't argue. Then the Board of Directors of the Crescent Moon made some other decisions,

> and I discontinued my work as editor. Last month Ch'en T'ung-po [Ch'en Yüan] and his wife came. When our conversation turned to 'Chao X-kuang shih', they both commended it warmly; I was happy about this vindication, and Su Hsüeh-lin and Yüan Ch'ang-ying also said the same thing; then I added that after all I was not really blind. But I never spoke to such senior men as Hu and Liang about this again to justify myself, since it was impossible to reason [with them] .(57)

From the above quotation it is clear that there existed a concealed subtle friction between Hsü and his Crescent Moon associates. The hope that the magazine could help to relieve his boredom at home and somewhat gratify his ambition in the field of literature was dashed. The frustration brought about in this undertaking intensified his deslike for Shanghai. In the same letter to Li Ch'i a passage reads: "In the latter part of this year I may teach in Nanking or somewhere else. Shanghai must definitely be quit."(58) As for the next move, he shared an idea with his former student:

> I rather wish to gather some other friends to publish a monthly devoted exclusively to literature since all the Crescent Moon dignitaries are keen on politics and seem to disdain literary pursuits.(59)

The Crescent Moon Monthly was primarily Hsü's creation. Although there was an editorial board, he was in fact the responsible person from the inception of the publication till the summer of 1929 with a break of about five months when he was away from China. (60) As noted in the foregoing pages, he was enthusiastic about the magazine which, in his vision as manifested by the

quotations from Genesis and Shelley at the very beginning of the leading article in the first issue, would bring "light" and "Spring" to the world, or at least the Chinese world.(61) Bearing this in mind, we can readily appreciate what a blow it was to him when he eventually felt compelled to resign the editorship. After that incident he still made contributions to the magazine, but only occasionally since he wrote little and was apparently not too happy about the whole business though he never hinted at it in front of his associates.

Liang Shih-ch'iu became the sole editor after Hsü, but he left Shanghai the next spring to join Wen I-to at Tsing-tao University (later the University of Shantung) and was succeeded by Lo Lung-chi (羅隆基).(62) The Crescent Moon Monthly under Lo's editorship grew to be a socio-political publication rather than a literary magazine, and soon it became a headache to the Nationalist government on account of its many brilliant critical essays aimed at the authoritative party machine of the Kuomintang; later Lo was even detained and questioned by the Kuomintang secret police and the magazine was almost banned by the government.(63) In view of Hsü's courage and zeal shown in his critical essays in the early twenties,(64) there was every reason to expect him to collaborate with his Crescent Moon friends in the attack on the government. However, he was silent throughout the whole period. An easy explanation of this is of course his loss of interest in politics; his letter to Li Ch'i as quoted above also seems to strengthen this view. But had he really lost interest in politics? Let us look into some facts before answering this question. First, as far as his published works are concerned, "Ch'iu-ch'ung" (秋蟲) (The Autumn Insects) and "Hsi-ch'uang" (西窗) (The Western Window) were anti-communist verses which appeared in the Crescent

Moon Monthly in 1928 - he at least continued to keep an eye on the communists in China and keep disparaging them.(65) Further, in his letters to Elmhirst written in 1928 and 1929, it is clear that he had the Chinese political and social conditions at his fingers' ends.(66) He was not indifferent. He did not forget politics. The fact is that his grievance and condemnation were directed at the communists and their fellow travellers, and at them alone. He was well aware of the authoritarianism of the Kuomintang, but since the Nationalists led by Chiang Kai-shek were anti-communists, first with and eventually without, disguise, Hsü must have felt it his moral duty not to open fire at them.(67) Communism in his eyes was the most dangerous and vicious enemy to him as an individual and to China as a nation; if he must criticize the anti-communist Kuomintang, he could not have done it before the communists, as a power, were totally wiped out from the Chinese political scene. But Hsü's attitude in the eyes of left-wing critics was reactionary and even counter-revolutionary and he was naturally classified as an ally of Chiang Kai-shek and his clique from the point of view that people were either friends or foes. As a matter of fact, all the Crescent Moon people held "a common antipathy" rather than a "basically friendly attitude"(68) towards the Kuomintang at least at that time, and when judging Hsü politically in terms of his relations with the Nationalist government, it seems unfair to interpret his refraining from attacks as active support or co-operation. The verdict that the publication of the Crescent Moon Monthly was primarily "for political activity, for advocating reformist views and for currying favour with the Kuomintang and Chiang Kai-shek"(69) is a distortion of truth.

In a less political and more specific tone, some people are of the opinion that the Crescent Moon Monthly was founded to combat the leftist trend in modern Chinese literature.(70) Liang Shih-ch'iu refuted this with the following remarks:

> The Crescent Moon was only one of the many magazines in the recent decades ... Those who were responsible for it were often called the 'Crescent Moon Clique' as if they were an organized society with some common programmes. In reality, this is not a fact.(71)

And further:

> We as a group had neither strict organization nor any ambition ... We all had some liberal tendency, and gathered in the same place by pure chance.(72)

Truly, the Crescent Moon people did not really lay it down as their objective to check the leftist literary movement, but in order to uphold "health and dignity", they inevitably acted as a counter-current in the turbulent leftist literary stream, and indeed the Monthly was the only literary publication that obstructed the leftist literary movement with some limited success. But this was mainly due to Liang Shih-ch'iu's polemics with Lu Hsün and his criticism of proletarian literature rather than Hsü's creative writings.(73)

The appearance of the Monthly is also said to have helped, inadvertently, the realization of solidarity among all the left-wing writers,(74) notably Lu Hsün and the people of the Creation Society and T'ai-yang she (太陽社) (The Sun Society) who before 1928 had been

engaged in malicious "pen-wars" among themselves for the leadership of modern Chinese literature. Indeed, the Crescent Moon Monthly was not only the enemy of all the left-wing writers but also a nuisance to the Nationalist government. This phenomenon significantly symbolizes the fate of the liberal intellectuals in China whose western education channelled their thought in such a way that they became in different degrees defenders of western democracy, hence victims in their country whose authoritarian tradition was as living in the twenties and thirties and is still alive nowadays as it was in the ancient times. The seedling of democracy was bound to wither on such hard soil even had the Crescent Moon people squeezed out their last ounce of energy on cultivating it.

As far as the magazine is concerned, Hsü Chih-mo as an influential force was merely felt in the first stage and in terms of literature. The whole bulk of his writings published in it was less impressive in quantity than that of Liang Shih-ch'iu and Lo Lung-chi. He contributed about two dozen poems and less than a score of prose works, including translations in both cases. All the poems later appeared in his third collection The Tiger and the prose works were all gathered in the Complete Works (1969) edited by Chiang Fu-ts'ung and Liang Shih-ch'iu.

In terms of poetry, the Crescent Moon Monthly was not exceptionally remarkable despite an initial flare when Hsü Chih-mo was at the helm. Wen I-to, Jao Meng-k'an, Ch'en Meng-chia, et al, in addition to Hsü himself, did write, but the quantity was small and the quality uneven. The spirit that fired the poets during the period of the Poetry Magazine (1926) was drooping with the progress of time.

The literary flavour of the Monthly, lost shortly after Hsü's departure from the editorial board, was considerably restored when the younger man of the group, Yeh Kung-ch'ao, assumed the editorship in September, 1932, in succession to Lo Lung-chi. But some internal trouble seemed to ensue and the last few issues of the magazine again carried a long list of editors including Hu Shih, Liang Shih-ch'iu, Yü Shang-yüan, Yeh Kung-ch'ao, Shao Hsün-mei (邵洵美), P'an Kuang-tan and Lo Lung-chi. Yeh and Shao were said to be the two responsible for editorial work.(75) The magazine ceased publication after June, 1933; then most Crescent Moon people, again under the leadership of Hu Shih, published Hsüeh-wen (學文) (Literary Studies) in Peking in May the next year with Yeh as the editor. The new magazine perished after four issues on account of a double pressure of financial difficulty and attacks from left-wing publications.(76)

The Literary Studies was evidently the successor to the Crescent Moon Monthly; the latter, however, was not quite the successor to Hsien-tai p'ing-lun (現代評論) (Contemporary Review) despite the fact that many people, especially the left-wing critics, are wont to regard it as such, so as to drive home the point that the bourgeoisie was in reality well organized in the form of a "clique" for successive and more effective attacks on the proletariat.(77) Kinship between the Contemporary Review and the Crescent Moon Monthly can only be satisfactorily established in terms of ideological affinity, as Ts'ao Chü-jen (曹聚仁), who was not quite left or right, commented: "The social and political views expressed in the Crescent Moon Monthly may be described as keeping in line with those of the Peking Morning Post and the Contemporary Review."(78)

The importance of Hsü's role played in the running of the Crescent Moon Monthly, just like that in the editorial work of the Poetry Magazine (Peking), is often exaggerated. Liang Shih-ch'iu's statement: "... Hsü Chih-mo was the soul of the Crescent Moon"(79) must be understood in its context - that is: in terms of the first stage of the Monthly.

C. Friends in and outside China.

1. Hu Shih.

Among all friends of the same generation, Hu Shih played the most important part in Hsü's life. The latter never precisely mentioned when he came to know Hu. A relevant fact was that Hu's Endeavour Weekly first introduced Hsü's verse to the Chinese public on 17th December, 1922.(80) Evidently their friendship flowered in the autumn of 1923 when they were roaming about scenic spots in Chekiang province and talking about scenery, life, love and everything.(81) Later back in Peking, they were colleagues at the National University and members of the Crescent Moon Society. Their friendship continued to grow till Hsü's death in 1931.

Looking closely into their thoughts, we shall see that Hsü's anti-materialism and mysticism, or religious feeling, were not compatible with Hu's philosophy which, with John Dewey's pragmatism as pivot, were heavily coloured with utilitarianism. But Hsü was essentially not a philosopher and would not have had sharp quarrels with Hu over philosophy. As to Hsü's romantic inclination, although Hu did not call himself a romantic and did not really like passionate love verse and was opposed to Rousseauism,(82) he certainly supported Hsü's romantic love affair with Lu Hsiao-man on the ground that anybody had the right to experiment with new life, new methods, new modes of expression, etc.(83) Examining the friendship of these two men, we shall not fail to see that it was cemented by many positive elements. Politically, they were for moderation and reform rather than extremity and revolution. They wished to see the birth of a democratic government of the

Anglo-American type in China; and on the social side, though Hsü did not cherish anything definite apart from the idea of rural reconstruction imported from India, he was in agreement with Hu about universal education. In the broad sense of westernization, they were both pioneers in introducing western literature to China and both demonstrated the avant-garde spirit, though in expression and style they were quite different. Temperamentally, they were very much alike. Yeh Kung-ch'ao's remarks about Hu Shih such as "having wide interests", "prone to being enthusiastic", "eager to help others", "optimistic, often susceptible to new schemes and new ideas" and so on were equally valid for Hsü Chih-mo.(84)

An interesting feature of these two men was the streak of traditionalism discernible in their life. Both of them evidently revered filial piety despite Hu's whole-hearted support for westernization and Hsü's divorce and second marriage which might be interpreted as defiance of his parents' wishes.(85) In addition to this, their attitude towards friendship and their strong sense of élitism and mission in life springing from Confucianism were identical.

Hu Shih thought highly of Hsü's talents and appreciated his peaceful nature and warm personality in particular. He deeply believed that Hsü's motive in the pursuit of his ideal was all pure and noble. He never questioned his friend's sincerity. He greatly admired Hsü's courage and valour revealed in all his pursuits in life. About this Hu wrote: "His pursuits shame us, for our faith is too weak; we never dare dream his dreams." In Hu's eyes, Hsü was a tragic hero to be respected, not an ineffectual dreamer to be despised.(86)

Hu often considered himself a kind of "big brother" to Hsü;(87) even after the latter's second marriage his concern did not diminish. He evidently

saw gaps in Hsü's academic training and was anxious that his "little brother" should be better equipped with more scholarship in order to be a first-rate university lecturer.(88) This expalins why he tried to get Hsü back in Cambridge or somewhere similar to study together with Lu Hsiao-man, and why he approached Elmhirst for extending help to Hsü in 1926.(89)

The only ideological conflict between Hsü and Hu was in 1926 over the question of Russia.(90) From Hu's conduct in later years, it was clear that he adopted Hsü's views rather than keeping up his admiration for the communist motherland. During the period of the Crescent Moon Monthly, Hsü could not be altogether happy with Hu's ideas but no serious friction ever marred their friendship.(91)

To Hu Shih Hsü Chih-mo could confide almost everything, including his love affairs. Indeed, even some of Hsü's private papers were open to Hu.(92) Hsü in his short life wrote numerous letters to Hu, pouring out his "voice, sorrow and laughter". On these letters Hu commented: "Every one of them is most lovely; nobody among my friends can write such lovely letters!"(93)

Hu Shih was such an animating influence on Hsü that the latter, acknowledging his friend's great personality, added the following as a prologue to his last and also his longest poem "Ai ti ling-kan" (愛的靈感) (The Inspiration of Love):

> To Shih-chih [Hu Shih] with compliments.
> The following lines, after all, owe their
> birth to him, just as most of my poems
> written in the last ten years owe, after
> all, their inspiration to his works.

Charged with typical Chinese courtesy, these words cannot be literally accepted, but they do show the degree of esteem Hsü cherished for his friend.(94)

Hsü and Hu were often together in their Shanghai period as already noted. When Hu was back to Peking at a later date, he, being well aware of Hsü's trouble with Lu Hsiao-man, urged his friend to join him at Peking University again for a change of environment, and Hsü accepted his advice and offer.(95) But his time they were destined to part company forever because of Hsü's tragic death.

Hu's grief was indescribable when the shocking news of Hsü's air crash was confirmed. When he later came to write a memorial essay on "the most lovable friend in the human world", as he called Hsü, he thought it his duty to vindicate Hsü's character over the latter's divorce and second marriage. He censured all the harsh critics of Hsü's conduct for their failure to grasp the "simple belief" of Hsü's philosophy of life.(96) Chiang Fu-ts'ung is right in his remark: "Mr. Hu was the only bosom friend of Chih-mo." But another one of his, i.e., "Mr. Hu's judgment of Chih-mo is ... the fairest." does not merit equal approval.(97)

2. Liang Shih-ch'iu.

Liang Shih-ch'iu first saw Hsü Chih-mo in 1922 when the latter came to Tsing Hua College to give a talk.(98) Liang was not impressed by the talk and his feeling towards Hsü after it was probably somewhat on the side of antipathy. Shortly before Liang left for America in August, 1923, he criticized Hsü for the latter's ridicule of a poetical

expression by Kuo Mo-jo.[99] But Liang and Hsü afterwards became friends and even fairly close literary associates at least for the Shanghai period. The development of their relationship is rather interesting.

Liang's name appeared in the Peking Morning Post even before he pursued his further studies abroad in 1923. He evidently continued to read the paper regularly in America, where he came under the influence of Irving Babbitt at Harvard.[100] After Hsü became the editor of the Supplement of the Morning Post Liang first sent him a long article of about eight thousand words, dispraising the romantic tendency in modern Chinese literature and raising a number of points which could be interpreted as criticism aimed at Hsü's literary views and practice. For instance, he denounced Europeanized Chinese; the cult of emotion and children; "pseudo-idealism"; prose poems; poetized prose; humanitarianism; universal pity; impressionistic approach to literary studies and criticism; the Rousseauesque return to nature, etc. etc. Besides, Hsü's heroes Walter Pater and Anatole France were singled out and slashed for their perversion of literary criticism.[101] One cannot but be tempted to guess after reading Liang's essay that he intended to test Hsü's tolerance by contributing this particular article to the Morning Post, and would not have been too surprised if Hsü had rejected it. The fact that it was soon accepted for publication must have impressed Liang not a little. It was probably because of this feeling, or admiration, that he came to cultivate Hsü's friendship and estrange his former dogmatic friends of the Creation Society upon his return to China by summer, 1926.

Liang, as a good pupil of Babbitt, continued to write and scoff at romanticism, and Hsü continued to welcome

his contributions.(102) These two friends became more intimate when they were later in Shanghai. Their difference over the editorial policy of the Crescent Moon Monthly was never an open clash and Liang may have never fathomed Hsü's feelings towards him in 1929 since Hsü did not argue for his case.(103)

Hsü and Liang were basically different in their approach to life and literature. Their collaboration was mainly because of "the liberal tendency" in both of them, as Liang sagaciously concluded.(104) A classicist and in many ways a traditionalist in consequence of his acceptance of neo-humanism in America, Liang after several decades was more convinced than ever that Hsü's Weltanschauung was essentially unsound. He applauded his friend's warm personality, the peculiar individual charm in his literary works and his enthusiasm about literature, etc., but he deplored Hsü's romantic love.(105) In his opinion, the world should always have some, but not too many, people like Hsü Chih-mo.(106)

Liang was a friend of Hsü, but not really a great friend as some people think he was. They had their common foe - communism, and a common aversion to totalitarianism; as to whether Hsü was influenced by Liang's neo-humanism, Liang's answer was "No".(107) Truly, nobody would imagine that Hsü would have considered Babbitt's gospel seriously; but by 1928, he must have acquired a more objective perspective concerning the value of passionate romantic love on account of the failure of his own marriage. Evidence has it that he did commend reason rather than passion in later days, and in this connection he might have been, most probably unconsciously, slightly swayed by neo-humanism.

3. Some younger literary friends.

In addition to the associates directly connected with the Crescent Moon Monthly, Hsü came into contact with a number of younger literary enthusiasts in Shanghai and Nanking. The friendship between him and them was mutually appreciated. In this group Shen Ts'ung-wen, Ch'en Meng-chia, Chao Ching-shen (趙景深) and Ho Chia-huai (何家槐) were among the most outstanding.(108) Although Shen's name already appeared in the Peking Morning Post before 1925, his literary career was furthered by Hsü who later also helped him to obtain a university post.(109) Without Hsü's encouragement and acceptance of his contributions for publication both in the Morning Post and the Crescent Moon Monthly, Shen, a poor junior clerk in his first Peking years, may not have been able to make both ends meet and his success as a writer would definitely have been hampered then and afterwards. However, Shen was by no means one of the founders of the Crescent Moon Monthly nor was he ever involved in the board of directors or in the editorial work of the magazine.

Ch'en Meng-chia, Chao Ching-shen and Ho Chia-huai were younger than Sen Ts'ung-wen and were Hsü Chih-mo's students. They achieved literary fame through the encouragement and help from their teacher. Chao and Ho especially were obliged to Hsü for his generous financial aid.(110) In fact many younger poets of the Poetry Magazine (Shanghai) - Pien Chih-lin (卞之琳), Fang Wei-teh, Fang Ling-jui(方令孺), Shao Hsün-mei, et al being among them - were the "little flowers" cultivated by Hsü the "gardener".(111)

An intriguing but little known episode is Hsü Chih-mo's assistance to Hu Yeh-p'in (胡也頻) and his common-law wife Ting Ling (丁玲).(112) Hu's name first

appeared in the Peking Morning Post. Apparently Hsü did not think so highly of him as he did of Shen Ts'ung-wen, but he did his best to help the young student.(113) Later in Shanghai, Hu's writings were also occasionally published in the Crescent Moon Monthly. He must have estranged Hsü after beginning to take part in clandestine communist activities by 1929.

When Hu had been arrested by the government in January, 1931 and Shen Ts'ung-wen was hurrying here and there trying to save his friend's life, Hsü together with Hu Shih wrote letters of introduction to Wu Ching-hsiung (吳經熊) and Ts'ai Yüan-p'ei for Shen who, acting on the request of Hu Yeh-p'in, was hoping desperately to mobilize all possible assistance from influential people.(114) The failure of every effort and the subsequent execution of Hu brought hardship as well as sorrow to Ting Ling who had given birth to a child not long before her husband's arrest. Witnessing the misfortune of the young widow, Hsü used his influence to help her sell the manuscript of a story to Chung Hua Shu-chü; and though rather hard up himself, he also managed to borrow money from his wealthy disciple Shao Hsün-mei for her.(115) Hsü's assistance to Ting Ling was undoubtedly made on the ground of his friendship with Shen Ts'ung-wen, but his kindness and especially his indiscriminate magnanimity were not always found in average people. He treated Hu Yeh-p'in and Ting Ling not as advocates of communism but as the needy and miserable.

Hsü's unfinished story "Tang nü-shih" (瑞女士) (Madam Tang) was the outcome of this incident. He paid tribute to Shen Ts'ung-wen for his many noble and selfless acts rendered to Ting Ling and her child after

Hu Yeh-p'in's imprisonment, he expressed his sympathy for Ting Ling, and commended Hu in the story. The background of this piece of writing has never been expressly identified owing to political reasons and is probably known to few at the present time; but the characters in it are unmistakable and the word "Ting" in Ting Ling and the word "Tang" in the title of the story "Madam Tang" are particularly meaningful in Chinese, for ting-tang (丁當) is not only a phrase equivalent to the English "ding-dong" but a word that may mean the breaking of something.(116) In the present case, Hu Yeh p'in's life was "broken", a family was "broken", and hearts were "broken". Indeed, those with an adequate knowledge of the situation in Shanghai with special reference to Hu Yeh-p'in and Ting Ling will see clearly who is who when reading Hsü's story together with Shen Ts'ung-wen's Chi Ting Ling hsü-chi (記丁玲續集) (Supplement to 'About Ting Ling').(117)

4. L. K. Elmhirst.

Hsü's English friend L. K. Elmhirst worked in India helping Tagore to carry out a rural reconstruction programme from 1922-24. The next year he and his newly-wedded wife purchased Dartington Hall in Devon, and started their own rural work under the inspiration of the Indian sage.(118) Hsü Chih-mo's "education programme" in relation to his "sentimental journey" in 1925 included visits to Elmhirst's place as well as Tagore's, i.e., Santiniketan, India. However, as chapter two states, neither of these two meccas did he see. But he did not forget them; and he

felt particularly drawn to Elmhirst's "great kingdom".[119] In a letter to his English friend he said:

> Devon now seems to me to be the only place on earth where I can see gleamings of hope; for frankly I can't like India much; I can never stand the heat while my admiration for English landscape is almost a passion.[120]

Obviously in Hsü's imagination rural reconstruction work was not so much serious rural work as the embodiment of the romantic idea of "return to nature" - the sort of idyllic life consisting mainly of "a beautiful forest, a somewhat dilapidated castle, and probably vast tracts of beautiful grassed lands" with an "aim ... to produce noble savages that would enravish (sic) [enrapture] J. J. Rousseau ... "[121] as he wrote to Elmhirst.

When Hu Shih proposed to Elmhirst in England in 1926 a further study scheme for Hsü and Hsiao-man in Europe, the generous Englishman at once agreed to help. On his return to China, Hu Shih acquainted Hsü with his talk with Elmhirst, to whom Hsü soon wrote and consequently received a handsome gift from Dartington Hall - £250![122]

Elmhirst's tentative plan for Hsü's and Hsiao-man's study programme was reasonably clear-cut and practical. In a note to his wife he made the following draft:

> I think we might do something in co-operation with Lowes Dickinson over this: i.e., we could have them [Hsü and his wife] off and on but they would have to come for a definite course of study in London or at Cambridge.[123]

Unfortunately neither Hsü nor his wife seemed to delight in doing academic studies by that time. Evidently Hsü was anxious to "fly abroad",[124] but simply because he was

disgusted with China. In his grateful, long reply to Elmhirst, he railed at the communists and complained of poverty and the want of means for going abroad with Hsiao-man; but to Elmhirst's earnest enquiries about his possible resumption of study at an English university, he did not bother to answer a word.(125) Then dramatically in the next summer (1928), he sailed without his wife for America, and from there he crossed the Atlantic for the second and also the last time.(126)

In England he renewed his old ties with Dickinson, Fry and other Cambridge friends and also the Russels in Cornwall.(127) He was desirous of paying a visit to Virginia Woolf and asked Roger Fry to make the introductions, but somehow it did not materialize.(128) Hsü was the guest at Dartington Hall for some days and finally "carried away ... not only happy and delightful memories but also hope and inspiration." He found Elmhirst's place "the nearest approach ... on earth to the idea of an Utopia."(129) Evidently he discussed with the Elmhirsts the defunct rural reconstruction project in China proposed during Tagore's visit in 1924. The Elmhirsts with their zeal and generosity promised to finance a new project in China and entrusted Hsü to start it with other interested persons like Chang P'eng-ch'un and Ch'ü Chü-nung.(130)

Hsü returned to Shanghai by November after paying his homage to Tagore in Santiniketan.(131) Soon afterwards he received altogether £300 from the Elmhirsts as the first donation for the China project.(132) According to Hsü's correspondence, he and others made investigations in both Kiangsu and Chekiang and chose the latter for experiment;(133) but after two months he wrote to Elmhirst telling him of the impossibility of launching anything in anywhere in the country owing to the absence of law and

order.[134] He wrote another long letter to his English friend a few months later, with only one sentence referring to the "project":

> The vision and inspiration that I carried back from Dartington Hall and Santiniketan - and what great and beautiful things they are - are resting helpless and pining away, being kidnapped as it were by vicious forces of a mal-adjusted society.[135]

As to the three hundred pounds, it was supposed to have been spent partly on Hsü's travel expenses and partly on the preliminary investigation. But except for a very rough budget submitted to Elmhirst earlier,[136] Hsü did not report to his friend again about the sum. Hsü himself also seemed to have kept silent about it throughout among his friends. Whether he did make the "investigation" or not therefore calls for our investigation. As a matter of fact, his statement about the absence of law and order in Chekiang was an exaggeration. On the other hand, even if he had really done the investigation, he would not have needed to spend all the money from Elmhirst. One thing was certain: he suddenly stopped writing to Elmhirst altogether.[137]

So Hsü disappointed Elmhirst first by his failure to resume studies in England and secondly by the "project" which did not even reach the stage of planning. Elmhirst was not unaware of Hsü's incapability of rural reconstruction work; he warned him against being "spiritual and artistic" and urged him to keep to the "practical needs of China".[138] Elmhirst was pretty sure that although Hsü was no rural economist, some of his friends were, and at least Hsü was trustworthy as a middleman. However, Hsü did not appear to have lived up to his friend's expectation. His subsequent ungrateful silence towards Elmhirst, indeed,

may have been owing to the embarrassment he felt in regard to the few hundred pounds. In view of Lu Hsiao-man's extravagance, he, or rather she might have spent whatever money that was made available to him, or her.

Apparently Hsü shared Tagore's vision that the élite should shoulder the responsibility of improving the welfare of the common people, especially those in the rural areas;(139) and he would of course like to have seen the birth of a Chinese Dartington Hall so that his idyllic aspirations could be realized. But he was no Elmhirst. He lacked the great wealth his English friend possessed and he was not the kind of practical rural economist as Elmhirst was; even under normal conditions, he was still incompetent to head the "project". What he could do in a "Chinese Dartington Hall" was perhaps act as director or advisor for cultural affairs.

D. The Poetry Magazine (Shanghai).

The Poetry Magazine (Shanghai) was the second publication devoted exclusively to pai-hua verse in China.(140) It could rightly be called Hsü Chih-mo's "child". He was the editor in every sense of the word.

In the "Hsü-yü" (序語) (Introductory Remarks) of the first issue, Hsü admitted that the magazine was the continuation of the Poetry Magazine of the Supplement to the Peking Morning Post published in 1926. Referring to modern Chinese poetry he said:

> First, we believe [pai-hua] poetry has a future ... Secondly we believe that poetry is the most unmistakable voice of an age. From it we can hear the spirit of a nation - whether it is substantial or empty; noble or frivolous; rising or falling ... Thirdly we believe poetry is an art ... We hope sooner or later we can emit a bit of light. A bit, but ever ascending; a bit, but inextinguishable in any hurricane.(141)

These words reflect Hsü's optimistic view about pai-hua verse in China and his belief in the close relationship between poetry and life. His idea of himself belonging to an élite with a mission in life is still there just as it exists in "The Attitude of the Crescent Moon" but in a much more subdued and humble tone. Besides, he was anxious not to monopolize the limelight though this time he had good reasons to do so; he mentioned other names, viz., Sun Ta-yü and Shao Hsün-mei as also responsible for the publication of the magazine, and he even put their names before his own.(142) At the end of the "Remarks", his humility culminated in a postscript: "Chih-mo chien ni" (志摩僭擬) (Written by Chih-mo through arrogation).(143)

The verses in the magazine demonstrate a step forward in modern Chinese poetry. The quality of the works on the whole exceeds that of those in the Poetry Magazine (Peking). There are regulated poems following the tradition exemplified by Wen I-to's "Dead Water", but less regular and even irregular pieces in terms of stanza form, poetic line, rhyme, etc. are also present. Indeed, even Wen I-to's own contribution "Ch'i-chi" (奇蹟) (Miracle) is not quite regular.(144)

As may be expected, the spirit of experiment is strong in the magazine. The most conspicuous feature is the introduction of more longer poems and the sonnet form (Italian). Lyricism abounds while colloquialism advocated in the former Poetry Magazine is on the wane. Political tendency, vigorous at least in the first issue of the previous magazine, is now altogether absent;(145) but there appears to be a growing interest in symbolism. Wen I-to's "Miracle" is a good example. Symbolic elements can be seen in a number of lines in Hsü Chih-mo's "The Inspiration of Love", "Yün yu" (雲遊) (Wandering in the Clouds), "Pieh ning wo, t'ung" (別擰我，疼) (Don't Pinch Me; Pain), etc., and they can also be detected in some other contributors' works. Thus the poets of the Poetry Magazine (Shanghai) played the role of precursors to the later symbolist movement in modern Chinese verse without themselves knowing it and without being sufficiently recognized as such by others. However, a couple of historians made the extravagant claim that Hsü and his associates actually stood for symbolism fair and square.(146)

Translation is also characteristic of the magazine. The emphasis is on such great names as Shakespeare and Goethe.

Hsü's influence is tangible in the Poetry Magazine (Shanghai). Ts'ao Pao-hua (曹葆華)'s "Pien-huan"

(變幻) (Mutability) in the second issue manifests unmistakable resemblance to Hsü's "The Inspiration of Love" in both form and content. Poems by Shao Hsün-mei, Sun Hsün-hou (孫洵侯), Lin Hui-yin and Ch'ih ch'ui (尺棰) also reveal traces of imitation of Hsü's works.

Hsü as editor of the magazine apparently keeps variety in mind. Very short lyrics are juxtaposed with long works; for example in the second issue, Pien Chih-lin's "Hsiao-shih" (小詩) (A Little Poem) is quite a contrast to Lei Po-wei (雷白韋)'s "Hui su" (慰訴) (Comforting Words) in terms of length of poetic lines. There are western sonnets and there are also songs and lyrics with the lingering flavour of classical Chinese verse, though the general orientation of the magazine is evidently western. In reply to the criticism by some people of this noticeable tendency, Hsü gives the following in defence of the stand of the magazine: "My personal feeling is that a literary revolution is just like a political revolution; thoroughness is most essential."(147) In his understanding, the revolutionary process of the pai-hua verse is still going on and what he means by "thoroughness" is a thorough delving into and then mastery of western poetry. He sincerely believes that extensive experiments will lead to the establishment of some standards for pai-hua poetry. His idea is similar to that of Liang Shih-ch'iu whose letter to Hsü published in the first issue of the magazine contains the following words: "I think at present we should boldly imitate foreign verse."(148)

However, Liang Shih-ch'iu made it clear that he was doubtful of the feasibility of adopting the western sonnet form in Chinese verse; he said: "To write sonnets in Chinese can never do."(149) Hsü did not agree with his friend on this. He affirmed that Sun Ta-yü's sonnets

as published in the magazine had "achieved relative success and stimulated many experiments in response".(150) He concluded that all this signified a healthy progress. The later development of modern Chinese verse confirmed Hsü's view. When Feng Chih (馮至) published his sonnets in 1941, few people doubted the position the western sonnet form held in pai-hua verse.(151)

Hsü Chih-mo's fondness for the British type of freedom of speech was also manifest in his editorial policy. His own opinions expressed in those introductory remarks and those in the letters by Liang Shih-ch'iu and Liang Tsung-tai (梁宗岱) were by no means unanimous.(152) He seemed out to create an atmosphere somewhat like that of the British parliament where contending views were openly debated.

Hsü Chih-mo was obviously less exclusive in the selection of contributions from outsiders than Wen I-to in 1926, and there were some names in the Magazine (Shanghai) familiar to nobody then or now. From this point of view, Hsü was a more liberal editor than Wen I-to and Liang Shih-ch'iu. Rigidity was not to his taste.

The Poetry Magazine (Shanghai) provided a limited space for prose - mainly for articles on poetry. The letters of Liang Shih-ch'iu and Liang Tsung-tai appeared there. It was Hsü's ambition to publish a special issue which would contain numerous articles on subjects such as the poet's experience in creation; the study of poetic technique and western poetry; the relations between pai-hua poetry and classical poetry, etc.(153) But his death occurring soon after the publication of the third issue killed all these plans at a stroke.

The Poetry Magazine (Shanghai) was supposed to be a quarterly; but after its second issue in April, 1931, there seemed to be some trouble and the third issue was not off the press till October.

Generally speaking, the Magazine was well received by the public and achieved a respectable circulation of nearly four thousand though it made no money for the poets nor the publishers - the Crescent Moon Book Company - because of its relatively low subscription rates. It won almost spectacular minority support since it was the only poetry magazine then of a relatively high quality, and the editor's name had its appeal, too. Contributions poured in from many provinces in China and also from abroad - Japan, France, Germany and Italy.(154) However, although the magazine, as Tai Wang-shu (戴望舒) later said, proved "to be flourishing for a period of time",(155) it may not have been so influential as its predecessor - the Poetry Magazine (Peking) - on account of the growing power and influence of the communists who were decidedly against such a publication as the Poetry Magazine (Shanghai). If Hsü had lived longer, the picture might have been a little different; still, the communist movement in China seemed destined to triumph over the Kuomintang and the formidable leftist force could hardly be effectively impeded even in the limited field of poetry.

After the death of Hsü Chih-mo, his devoted disciple and imitator Shao Hsün-mei(156) managed to publish another issue of Poetry Magazine; however, he was not Hsü Chih-mo and was unable to carry on the work.(157) A few years afterwards, Shao, a more mature man in every respect, was anxious to spread "Hsü Chih-moism" in literary circles in Shanghai. He attempted to complete Hsü's unfinished story "Madam Tang".(158) He produced "Hsü Chih-moistic"

poetized prose. He founded I she (蟻社) (Ants' Club), modelled somewhat on the Crescent Moon Society of Peking but far more ambitious.(159) He made himself busy and active in many things having to do directly or indirectly with literature.(160) His achievements, however, were limited. Then the Sino-Japanese war broke out in 1937, and all his plans and ambitions dissolved.

According to P'u Feng (蒲風), Shih p'ien (詩篇) (Pages of Poetry), a poetry magazine first published in November , 1933 and edited by Chu Wei-chi (朱維基), a friend of Shao Hsün-mei, was the Poetry Magazine (Shanghai) resurrected and in it "there were quite a number of little Hsü Chih-mos manufacturing sonnets on large scale."(161) Again, another Shih k'an (詩刊) (Poetry Magazine) was announced in 1937, with such names as Pien Chih-lin, Liang Tsung-tai, Sun Ta-yü, Tai Wang-shu and Feng Chih as editors.(162) The leftist critics consider these two publications more or less the continuation of Hsü Chih-mo's Poetry Magazine (Shanghai).

All in all, "Hsü Chih-moism" was completely wiped out from the field of modern Chinese literature when Shao Hsün-mei's name was no longer heard after the late thirties.

Chiefly owing to subtle political reasons, Hsü Chih-mo has been well known in Taiwan since 1949, after the Nationalists set up their government there. Hsü's works occupy a prominent place on the shelves in all book shops in every city. But in the literary circles, the "modern" poets, who are generally more aggressive and articulate than others, definitely rate him lower than Tai Wang-shu and Li Chin-fa though none will deny his role as a most influential and glamourous literary "activist".(163) As to the academic people there, perhaps none of them specializes

in modern Chinese literature (which in the eyes of the traditionalist is a strange, hybrid abomination) and few of them would condescend to study Hsü Chih-mo or his contemporaries. True, even if they should want to do some research in this direction, they would be hampered on account of the peculiar political atmosphere and lack of materials there. Nevertheless, the Taiwan journalists are always enthusiastic about Hsü Chih-mo not because of his poetry or prose but because of his notorious love affairs which can at least be exploited occasionally in a half historical and half fictional story to gratify the reading public.

The name Shih k'an (詩刊) (Poetry Magazine) seems to possess some charm that delights people of different political leanings. The poetry magazine edited by Tsang K'e-chia in mainland China is called precisely by that name. As far as Hsü Chih-mo is concerned, he was discussed three times in that publication first by his former student Ch'en Meng-chia and then by Pa Jen (巴人); both of them were eventually censured by Yin Chin-p'ei (殷晉培) for their favourable remarks on Hsü's poetry.(164) Tsang K'e-chia, who as a poet first learned his craft from the Crescent Moon group, acknowledged a couple of good points in Hsü's works by the "Hundred Flowers" period;(165) but when the "Flowers" had withered, he did not, or dared not, turn to the dangerous subject of Hsü Chih-mo again. There is not much hope that Hsü will be in any way rehabilitated in the People's Republic of China. There he must share the fate of his bosom friend Hu Shih.

In adiition to the publication of the Crescent Moon Monthly and the Poetry Magazine, Hsü was engaged in other literary and cultural activities in his Shanghai years. He broadcast at least once, served as a member

of the Board of the China Foundation for the Promotion of Education and Culture (in Chinese: 中英文化基金委員會), and was one of the founders and then an active member of the Chinese P.E.N.[166] He had so many friends that it took him three consecutive days in order to entertain them in a restaurant in Shanghai shortly after he decided to accept an appointment of Peking University in 1931.[167]

E. Poetical works.[168]

1. Poems relating to love and life.

According to the poet himself, all the verses in The Tiger were written between 1927 and 1931 except for a few done in 1924.[169] He did not specify the latter. However, Ch'en Ts'ung-chou claimed that "Huo-kai" (活該) (You Deservie It) was composed in 1923.[170] Ch'en was not a reliable biographer but "You Deserve It" did fit in Hsü's love life in that year. Besides, "Wo teng-hou ni" (我等候你) (I Wait for You) and "Kan chao-chi" (趕着急) (Anxiety) seem to date from before October, 1925 judging by their content.[171] But it is also possible that they were written after that time in a retrospective mood when the poet had won Lu Hsiao-man. "Ch'un ti tou-sheng" (春的投生) (Rebirth of Spring), "Don't Pinch Me; Pain" and "Li t'iao" (鯉跳) (A Beautiful Jump) are sweet and rosy love poems indicative of the happy period when Hsü and Hsiao-man, free and gay, were enjoying their love life either before or soon after their marriage. The passion and ecstasy of the first two of the trio are also tinged with a strong sense of carnality.

The first sign of gloom in their married life can be detected in "Ts'an ch'un" (殘春) (Late Spring), a lyric written on 20th April, 1927.[172] By that time the love between Hsü and Hsiao-man had not yet reached a point of crisis, but boredom and restlessness already compelled him to soliloquize thus: "The pretty flower in your vase of life has also changed; / A charming corpse for whom to bury?" (From: "Late Spring"). But before a year passed, the poet had been sadly disappointed with love and life.

Mao Tun saw in "Wo pu chih-tao feng shih tsai na i-ko fang-hsiang ch'ui" (我不知道風是在那一個方向吹) (I Don't Know in Which Direction the Wind Blows), one of Hsü's well-known lyrics published in March, 1928, an indication of the poet's disillusion with the political chaos in China.(173) It is a possible explanation; but judging from Hsü's life and feelings in that year, it seems far more convincing to treat the poem at its face value. Indeed, the six stanzas appear to be the six stages of his love life with Lu Hsiao-man; the last line of each stanza reveals one particular phase: (a) "Flowing in the ripples of dreams"; (b) "Her sweet gentleness - my indulgence"; (c) "Sweetness is the light of dreams"; (d) "Her change - my sorrow"; (e) "Being broken-hearted in the grief of dreams"; (f) "Gloom is the light of dreams". From dreams of sweetness to dreams of gloom - this is a true picture of Hsü's life from 1926 to 1928.

In less than a year later, Hsü published "Chi-hou" (季候) (Seasons). Chang Chün-ku (章君穀) suggests that this short lyric signifies the whole range of "love seasons" between the poet and Hsiao-man;(174) perhaps few people would disagree with Chang. The last stanza denotes estrangement between "he" and "she"; in other words, love is dead. By contrast, troubles are alive and more real than ever; the poem "Sheng-huo" (生活) (Life), written only a few months afterwards, conveys profound despair.(175)

Hsü was already deep in the mire when he wrote "life". He saw no hope; what lay before him seemed to be nothing but destruction. Eventually, he appeared as a penitent and made the following confession in "Ling tsui" (領罪) (Acceptance of Penalty):

For this is my only chance:
To come to myself to accept,
To accept penalty. If not, what is it?
Life in these days has sealed my mouth!

"Nan-wang" (難忘) (Hard to Forget) was also a poem of the same category. It expressed the "anger", "sorrow" and "repentance" seething in his mind and sapping his energy.

The reader will notice that Hsü's love poems are not free from obscurity. This is understandable when the poet's love life is taken into consideration; as T. S. Eliot has pointed out, "personal causes" often "make it impossible for a poet to express himself in any but an obscure way".(176) Indeed, in both cases of Lin Hui-yin and Lu Hsiao-man, the clandestine affairs required camouflage. In the last stage of his married life, his frustration and depression chiefly caused by his second wife could not be exposed since he had to save his own face and live up to a certain noble image. His need for obscurity led him to symbolism though it would be foolish to conclude that all the symbolist elements in his later works were due to his married life.

We can legitimately call "Yüan te" (怨得) (Complaint) and "Shen-yeh" (深夜) (Late at Night) symbolist poems. They were written in London when the poet was visiting the country he loved for the last time in 1928. Whatever their implication, they are different from Hsü's early works in terms of expression - no verbiage; no complicated imagery; no "philosophy". There is something of the intensity and hardness of imagist poetry about them but they are, unlike most imagist works, fairly regular in stanza forms and well-rhymed. Furthermore, they are short, looking almost like "short verse". These two poems are a new facet of Hsü's creative work during his last years.

They suited his mood at that time as he remarked: "The fact is that in these years we are all short-winded - poetry is always short verses; drama, one-act plays; fiction, short stories."(177) Obviously Hsü did not think much of "short" literary products. He also added:

> Whenever I look at such works as Shakespeare's plays, Dante's Divine Comedy, Goethe's Faust and so on, I despair ... O Heaven! When can we see some respectable works from our hands?(178)

When it was decided that the Poetry Magazine was to be revived in Shanghai, Hsü, under a wave of inspiration and enthusiasm after the contact with some young poets, was hoping eagerly for "a real opportunity of resurrection";(179) he felt the urge to compose long, or at least longer works, hence the birth of "The Inspiration of Love", his swan-song of over four hundred lines.(180) It is noteworthy that Hsü in his last days practised both short lyrics and long narrative poems. There was every possibility that if he had lived longer, he would have produced more longer works.

2. Social poems.

There are few social poems in the last two collections of Hsü. "Fu-lu sung" (俘虜頌) (Hymn to the Captive) is apparently the record of a scene of the Chinese civil war; the tone of the poem is quiet and satirical - recognizably Hardyan. According to the postscript attached to the poem by the poet, the original

last stanza, being "an un-revolutionary tail", had been cut off when the poem first appeared in the Contemporary Review.(181) It would seem that the "tail" might have been Hsü's condemnation of the civil war, or more specifically, of the Northern Expedition which was supposed to be a revolutionary operation at that time.

Whereas humanitarianism is only obliquely touched upon in "Hymn to the Captive", it is the main theme in "Tsai pu chih ming ti tao p'ang" (在不知名的道旁) (By An Unknown Roadside); and it figures remarkably in part of "The Inspiration of Love" which deals with the heroine's selfless work among the peasants in a remote village. It also seems to be mixed with the poet's idea of rural reconstruction which, as a form of Rousseauesque return to nature, is often alive in the poet's mind.

In "The Autumn Insect" Hsü imputed the intellectual sterility of the Chinese to the invasion and dominance of the communist ideology - "Thought is being sorely raped by isms", and he predicted that worse days would come as a consequence.(182) In "The West Window" he almost openly attacked the Creation Society which by 1928 was a platform for communism. He held the left-wing writers in contempt because he considered them nothing but profiteers and sophists.

"The West Window" when first published in the Crescent Moon Monthly (vol. IV, No. 4) carried the English sub-title "In imitation of T. S. Eliot".(183) This is interesting, for he did not seem to have developed any interest in Eliot while in England as a student. His discovery of the English poet in Shanghai might have been due to Yeh Kung-ch'ao, one of his Crescent Moon associates, who was an early advocate of Eliot in China.(184) "The

West Window" was apparently written under the influence of Eliot's "Rhapsody on A Windy Night" (1917). Apart from the same familiar style and many similar images in these two poems, about which we do not propose to go into detail, their social elements such as the street scene, street smells, some aspects of human life, etc. are comparable.

Liang Shih-ch'iu commenting on Hsü's poetry has said that the poet "occasionally expresses his sense of righteousness concerning society and politics".(185) These words obviously refer to Hsü's social poems and "the sense of righteousness" is basically his humanitarianism, anti-communism and anti-militarism.

3. Reflective poems.

In The Tiger and Yün yu (雲遊) (Wandering in the Clouds), the idea that small things are precious, great, and praiseworthy is found in such poems as "Pai hsien" (拜獻) (Worship and Dedication), "K'uo ti hai" (闊的海) (The Wide Sea) and "Ch'e shang" (車上) (On Board a Train). As a contrast, what is generally supposed to be great and sublime is implicitly disparaged. But a close examination of this idea will reveal that Hsü's commendation of the little things is not divorced from an aspiration to ultimate greatness. In "The Wide Sea", for instance, the "crevice" is an "undying crevice" and therefore the implication is of immortality, which is even greater than greatness. By extension, the "one minute" and the "one tiny light" are not the ordinary minute or light but the immortal time and immortal light. The

concept of the immortal minute is also expressed in an early work "Thank Heaven, My Heart Leaps Up Once Again" and that of the immortal light is further advanced in the "Introductory Remarks" of the first issue of the Poetry Magazine (Shanghai). Likewise, in "On Board A Train", joy is brought to all the passengers by the song of a little girl who, a "soloist", brightens every inch of the long, dull journey by her singing. Whether the poem is based on facts is unimportant; what interests us is that the whole description is symbolic. It would seem reasonable to take the passengers for all the people of the world who, in the stream of time, i.e., the journey in the train, are all weary of life; what gladdens and refreshes them is not from something great but from something small which springs spontaneously from a loving heart, namely, the song sung by the little girl. Again, in "T'a yen li yu ni" (他眼裏有你) (His Eyes Have Thee), God, the greatest and mightiest, does not exist in great Heavens or the vast underworld but in the little eyes of a little child.

The idea of reaching through littleness to greatness, being analogous to the Christian doctrine of humility leading to glory, is remarkable in the later works of Hsü; it stands in a way for Hsü the man in the last stage of his life when he felt the gradual decline of himself in various ways. He was frustrated again and again in love, and in the literary world, his ambition to shine and dominate in the beginning stage of the Crescent Moon Monthly was crushed in the space of a year. In his last days he could not but confess that he was down and out, a small, humble creature that could boast of nothing. But he needed not succumb to fate long. When Ch'en Meng-chia, Fang Wei-te and others rekindled his literary enthusiasm, he was up

again; but this time he was not quite his old self. Threads of humility had been woven into the fabric of his life and his character acquired some maturity. Although he still aimed at greatness, he would only make attempts on the basis of small, or at least smaller words, not grandiloquence. A comparative reading of his "Introductory Remarks" (Poetry Magazine, 1931, No. 1), the preface of The Tiger, " Shih-k'an pien-yen" (詩刊弁言) (Introductory Note to the Poetry Magazine) and "Ying shang ch'ien ch'ü" (迎上前去) (Marching Forward) will bring this point into relief.

Chao Ching-shen mentioned "religious piety" when referring to Hsü's The Tiger.(186) Indeed, the poet in "Acceptance of Penalty" told the world that he was a penitent. This poem, and "Tsai ping chung" (在病中) (Hours of Illness) as well, were strong in religious thought; the former slanted towards Christianity and the latter, Buddhism. In his longest work "The Inspiration of Love", while there are Christian elements like sin, prayer, worship of Jesus, etc., there is the idea of immortality through metamorphosis, which in "Ch'iu-yüeh" (秋月) (The Autumn Moon) is even more prominent. Although there was no sign in Hsü's last years that he had solved the problem of life and death that seemed to begin to worry him at the start of his intellectual awakening, in the light of "The Inspiration of Love" and "The Autumn Moon" we may be inclined to favour the opinion that death was not particularly perplexing and dreadful to him. Life and death were but different forms of existence, albeit death dissolved everything into small particles, or atoms. According to him: "In the depths of every fibre / Unfold / The smiles of a baby. (From: "The Autumn Moon). The process of mutation forever goes on, and there is also the subtle revelation that samsāra

(the cycle of births and deaths) is a permanent phenomenon of the universe. Death viewed from this angle could well be welcomed if life on this earth was not absolutely gratifying.

"Liang-ko yüeh-liang" (兩個月亮) (Two Moons) looks like a love poem but since it was written on 2nd April, 1931, any reference to Lu Hsiao-man or other women could be ruled out. Mao Tun contended that it was a philosophical poem denoting "reality is always imperfect;only the 'ideal' has 'unlimited power' ".(187) Indeed, if this work is accepted as a philosophical poem, there should not be much quarrel with Mao Tun. It must be pointed out, however, that the second moon in the poem, as 'ideal', should not be confined to a political sense. This "disc of perfection and brightness ... that never wanes" seems to be the same poetic inspiration as is termed the "spiritual deity behind the curtains" in the preface of The Tiger. The whole idea is an echo to the poet's earlier work "The Atom of God-like Flame". The belief that inside himself there was something, though mysterious, yet absolutely mighty, sacred and immortal would surely energize him to struggle on in life, however heavy the defeats he suffered might have been.

A somewhat conflicting thought is seen in "Huo-ch'e ch'in-chu kuei" (火車禽住軌) (The Train Is on Its Rails) since the poet scoffs at "light, wisdom, and eternal beauty". St. Paul's words can best convey the philosophical conclusion implied in that poem: "... the whole creation has been groaning in travail together ... and not only the creation, but we ourselves ..." (Romans, 8:22 f.). A Hardyan poem, "The Train Is on Its Rails" strikes a note of world-weariness; it drew tears from Lin Hui-yin's eyes when she passed the poet's native town on a train four years after his death.(188)

The reflective poems in Hsü's last two collections evince the first sign of mellowness in his character and thought. Though feeble, the sign bespoke a personal "renaissance" of the poet after 1930. But the cycle of births and deaths revolved too fast; he was soon hurried into the form of death from the form of life.

4. Forms.

Generally speaking, The Tiger and Wandering in the Clouds are continuations of A Night in Florence in terms of forms, and therefore what is common to them all and has been discussed previously need not be repeated.

In addition to the predominant qurtrain, couplets also frequently appear in Hsü's last two collections; but quite a number of poems have only one verse paragraph each. They may be called the freest kind of form since their length is flexible to the utmost. This form embodies the poet's preference for narrative verse, or longer works, in his last creative years.

As noted before, A Night in Florence marked Hsü's change to a more serious approach to poetry in terms of technique, but it must be understood that ke-lü (forms) in Hsü was not created out of strong commitment to a clear-cut poetic theory as it was in Wen I-to. What prompted Hsü to follow Wen was by and large his enthusiasm for experiment, but, as he commented on himself: "... my inherent informal nature never allowed me to follow I-to and others to delve deeply into poetic theories".(189) Indeed, he was not to be confined to a certain type of verse. On the other hand, he never completely forgot his first love,

free verse. In his last two collections, several poems written in free verse were justaposed with some regulated ones of the type of Wen I-to's "Dead Water". Besides, he also experimented with the European sonnet in "Hsien-tz'u" (獻詞) (Dedication) which, with its peculiar rhyming scheme of aabb ccdd efef gg, is neither Italian nor precisely English; although the length of its lines is on the whole uniform with eleven characters each, there are two salient shorter lines in the first quatrain. Admittedly, even a novice could "perfect" these two lines by adding one or two characters respectively to them; the fact that Hsü left them "imperfect" was obviously done with intent. There is something of irregularity in regularity, and of the poet's "informal nature" in the composition.

"Dedication" is the only sonnet Hsü wrote.(190) Judging from his words first in "Pai-lang-ning fu-jen ti ch'ing-shih" (白郎寧夫人的情詩) (Love Poems of Mrs. Browning)(191) and then in the preface of the second issue of the Poetry Magazine (Shanghai), he was in favour of extensive experiments with the sonnet form. If he had lived longer, he would most probably have produced more sonnets and simultaneously would have continued to write free verse, and poems of different kinds of stanzaic variations, too. Did this seemingly endless experiment with forms signify his admiration for the versatility of the great figures of the Renaissance; or the serious performance of a dedicated pioneer who was eager to infuse as much new blood into Chinese poetry as possible; or simply a blind imitation of Thomas Hardy; or merely a display of talents; or only the manifestation of the latent childish playfulness in a man who was likely to be excited by anything new, western and exotic? All these surmises are arguable.

Whatever the final answer may be, the results of his experiments are pregnant with reference value for poets after him.

Having come to the last part of discussion of Hsü's experiment with forms, we can conclude that he from the beginning to the end did not actually experiment with established stanza forms in English poetry, nor did he try his hand at the forms of Chinese folk songs. He drew inspiration and enlightenment from the English poets, but he created freely whatever forms he considered appropriate vehicles for his poetic thoughts. He did not tell us which form or forms would be the best or better for modern Chinese verse because in his estimate his experiments were far from completion.(192) Although he showed a personal bias towards the quatrain, that did not seem to be related to Jao Meng-k'an's favourite poet A. E. Housman; and truly, Hsü never even hinted that the quatrain was necessarily more desirable than others as a form. He believed that stanzaic variation was an important factor in the success of Hardy as a poet, and he himself apparently adopted variety as the guiding principle in his experiment with poetic forms.(193)

5. Language.

What is true about wen-yen expressions in A Night in Florence is also true in The Tiger and Wandering in the Clouds. That which remains to be added here is just a few words concerning the difference between Hsü's and his contemporaries' wen-yen elements.

Those Chinese intellectuals who emerged as pai-hua

poets soon after Hu Shih were often entangled in the classical language even though they intentionally wrote pai-hua poetry since they, being nurtured over two decades in the traditional medium, could not easily break away from their habitual mode of expression. They envied the younger men of their trade who, less heavily "poisoned" by wen-yen, could produce verses the language of which was as plain as everyday speech.(194) Hsü Chih-mo certainly did not think it right to discard wen-yen indiscriminately, but it must be noted here that Li Chin-fa rather than Hsü was the person who purposely and persistently re-introduced a great deal of wen-yen into pai-hua verse. Li's wen-yen elements included a number of one-character conjunctions like "sui" (遂) (then); "jo" (若) (if); "nai" (乃) (and; then) and many hsü-tzu (虛字) (particles) such as "yeh" (也); "hu" (乎), etc.; the possessive "chih" (之) was also extensively used. This practive was condemned by almost all people in the twenties. Hsü did not commit such "crimes"; even in his early days as a poet, he was careful not to resort to the above words except in one or two isolated cases. But he seemed determined to establish some English syntax in his verse. This tendency was even more conspicuous in The Tiger and Wandering in the Clouds.(195) Whether Hsü's un-Chinese sentences are commendable or deplorable depends largely on personal tastes. Perhaps we can offer the opinion without offending good judgment that to most educated Chinese with a competent knowledge of English or other western languages, Hsü's westernization is acceptable if not entirely successful. His shortcoming lies in confusion of ideas; the following sentence is typical: "Na shih ch'un ai ti ch'ü-shih wo hsin" (那是純愛的驅使我信) which, meaning as the poet intends "It is the drive of love, I believe", would be more

readily understood as "It is genuine love that makes me believe" because of the un-Chinese syntax. Such westernization is undesirable and in fact unnecessary. But the traditionalist will go further and declare that all Hsü's westernization is unjustifiable on the grounds that the Chinese language is expressive enough to convey every poetic sentiment. A fair answer to such objection might be that no language can claim to be so rich and self-sufficient that any further enrichment is superfluous.

Reduplication diminishes in the last two collections of Hsü's works but the whole poem of "Ts'an-p'o" (残破) (Brokenness) rests visibly on the opening line of every stanza "shen shen ti tsai shen-yèh li tso che" (深深的在深夜裏坐着) (Sitting deeply in the deep night) which reminds us of such famous poetic expressions in Chinese figuring prominently in reduplication as "Ting-yüan shen shen shen chi-hsü" (庭院深深深幾許) (What seclusion is the secluded courtyard) and "san ch'un san-yüeh i san pa" (三春三月憶三巴) (Remembering Three Pa in the third month during the three months of Spring).(197) But in Hsü's case, it is very doubtful whether "shen shen ti" (深深的) (deeply) as adverb can qualify the verb "tso" (坐) (sitting) even in verse. One may "ching ching ti tso" (靜靜的坐) (sitting quietly), "yang yang ti tso" (怏怏的坐) (sitting despondently), "ying ying ti tso" (硬硬的坐) (sitting stiffly), etc., but "shen shen ti tso" (深深的坐) (sitting deeply) is too unnatural to be tolerated; indeed, after almost five decades we can now safely judge that it has failed to establish itself as an expression in Chinese simply because it does not really mean anything.

It has been noted in last chapter that Hsü uses quite a number of long adjectives in A Night in Florence;

there are more and longer ones in The Tiger, for example: "i chüan chüan ch'eng yün-ts'ai ti" (一捲捲成雲彩的) (like clouds in rolls), "tsai shih-t'i ti o-ch'ou neng tsui tao jen ti" (在屍體的惡臭能醉倒人的) (where the stench of dead bodies can intoxicate), etc.(198) These long expressions are in fact adjective phrases and adjective clauses imported from written English. They, in their sinicized forms, would be used to good purpose though too many of them would bring about a cloying and clogging effect. Fortunately Hsü did not quite exceed the limit of moderation.

Colloquialism has its place in The Tiger and Wandering in the Clouds just as it does in A Night in Florence. A special feature is seen in "Hymn to the Captive" in which a few lines with heavey wen-yen flavour and even classical allusion are blended with the overall colloquialism. The wen-yen elements are used mainly for narrative purposes and they do not destroy the general colloquial atmosphere of the poem. It is not clear whether this combination is a conscious new attempt in the poet's creation.

In spite of all the defects in Hsü's last two collections, he managed to make progress in his language. His success lay in his poetic diction which had an inventiveness and lyrical beauty. But from a historical point of view it needs mentioning that Hsü has been exceeded by a few present-day pai-hua poets in Taiwan.(199) The Taiwan men may be criticized by the older generation for their obscurity and extreme modernism in a great deal of their work, but their success in creating an expressive language is not to be slighted. Hsü and almost all the poets before the forties are not held highly by them, who are far more confident than their predecessors of

their superiority in the domain of poetry; but Ya Hsien (瘂弦) at least admitted that Hsü was one of those who helped to develop modern Chinese verse.(200)

6. Imagery.

In this discussion we again concentrate on night as the all-prevailing image in Hsü's poetry. Significantly, it is even more conspicuous in the poet's last two collections. It represents the deepening darkness of his life and proves to be premonition of its tragic end.

Of the two scores or so of poems with night as the setting, "Rebirth of Spring" and "Don't Pinch Me; Pain" do convey the idea of "tender is the night" since they depict the happiness the poet enjoyed shortly after he married, ar at least lived together with, Lu Hsiao-man. But they are the only two in which the night imagery is directly associated with warmth and delight. The rest, with the exception of "Shan chung" (山中) (In the Mountains) and "Two Moons" that may be termed neutral, are all imbued with sadness and even gloom in varying degrees. "I Don't Know in Which Direction the Wind Blows" "Brokenness", "Yen-erh men" (雁兒們) (The Wild Geese), "The Train Is on Its Rails", etc. are all sorrowful verses enveloped by the dark atmosphere of night. "The sky and earth are getting dark, / The future has no light" (201) is a cry of despair or an exact picture of Hsü's feelings in his Shanghai years.

The night image in "Tu-chüan" (杜鵑) (The Cuckoo), albeit a setting, is an essential part on which the image of the bird depends. The cuckoo, which is often equated with the nightingale in Hsü, singing and dripping

blood from its mouth the whole night is Hsü's own self-portrait. This view enjoys support from the very last paragraph of the preface of The Tiger; there the poet compares himself to a nightingale which, in the darkness of night warbling "the light of the stars and the moon, and the hopes of mankind", pours out its last drop of blood and perishes.(202)

Further, the religious tendency and mysticism revealed in Hsü's last poems are closely associated with the night. It is essential to such poems as "The Autumn Moon", "Hours of Illness" and "The Inspiration of Love".

Hsü's night is often rather quiet, dreamy and is accompanied with light rather than heavy objects. This feature is especially striking in his last two collections of which the celebrated lyric "Farewell Again to Cambridge" and another exquisite one, i.e., "In the Mountains", are very typical. In the former poem, the expressions "lightly" and "quietly" in the first and last stanzas respectively not only describe the movement of the poet but denote the quality of the summer night in Cambridge. The objects helping to complete the picture of the poem: "yün-ts'ai" (雲彩) (clouds), "chin-liu" (金柳) (golden willows), "po-kuang" (波光) (light of waves), "yen-ying" (艷影) (a charming reflection), "ch'ing-hsing" (青荇) (verdant grass), "jou-po" (柔波) (gentle ripples), "fou-tsao" (浮藻) (floating weeds), "ts'ai-hung" (彩虹) (rainbow), "meng" (夢) (dreams), etc. are all light things. The only expression that seems to convey the sense of heaviness is "man-tsai" (滿載) (filled with), but the load is merely "hsing-hui" (星輝) (starlight). The line "man-tsai i-ch'uan hsing-hui" (滿載一船星輝) (With the whole boat filled with starlight), interestingly, seems to imply that the poem

is heavy with a great number of light things all of which assume their sweet charm in the all-pervading image of night. "In the Mountains" can be appreciated likewise.

Hsü was fond of the state of "tranquility and repose" which was religious as well as nocturnal.(203) He praised Katherine Mansfield's short stories for their "impression of beauty" which, according to him, was realized in Chinese in Lin Pu (林逋)'s famous lines: "Shu-ying hsieh-heng shui ch'ing ch'ien, / An-hsiang fou-tung yüeh huang-hun" (疎影斜橫水清淺,暗香浮動月黃昏) (Reflection of a few branches on the clear and shallow water; / A subtle fragrance floating in the moonlight at night).(204) The beauty created by Lin is fundamentally in consonance with the night imagery in Keats's "Ode to A Nightingale" from which Hsü often drew his inspiration. Although there is sadness in the night imagery in The Tiger and Wandering in the Clouds, intoxication, albeit barely tangible, is also present. It may be a kind of drugged joy; nevertheless it alleviated pain and added a modicum of warm colour to the grey palette of life - if not from hour to hour, at least during the sweet nocturnal time. The night imagery in Hsü's poetry is not an accidental and isolated phenomenon.

N O T E S

(Chapter four)

1. See CW, VI, pp. 247-250.

2. See CW, IV, p. 521.

3. See CW, III, p. 396.

4. See CW, I, p. 624, IV, p. 527.

5. Ibid. Hsiao-man got her divorce in September, 1925; the long delay of her second marriage must have been due to Hsü's financial difficulty.

6. See CW, IV, p. 530.

7. See CW, I, pp. 624 f.

8. See CW, IV, p. 528.

9. See CW, IV, p. 529.

10. See CW, IV, p. 530.

11. See CW, IV, p. 529.

12. See CW, IV, pp. 532, 534.

13. The "stagnation" must not be understood as "death". Hsü continued to write, but wrote little. It should be pointed out that the fairly impressive list of his works published in 1927 is deceptive, for the writings were mostly done before his personal crisis.

14. See Mao Tun, "Hsü Chih-mo lun", pp. 522, 528 f.

15. See CW, IV, p. 445.

16. See CW, I, pp. 34, 77 f., 89; an entry from Hsü's diary in Ch'en Ts'ung-chou, op. cit. p. 79; Liang Shih-ch'iu, T'an Hsü Chih-mo, fascimile of Hsü's letter to Liang dated Friday (no page number).

17. See CW, I, p. 348; see also Chang Chün-ku, op. cit. p. 370.

18. See chapter 1, p. 19.

19. See CW, IV, p. 505; also CW, VI, pp. 325, 327.

20. See CW, IV, p. 361.

21. See CW, IV, pp. 308, 352.

22. See CW, IV, pp. 251, 291, 310 f., 354, 360.

23. CW, IV, p. 266.

24. See CW, VI, p. 325.

25. See chapter 3, p. 199.

26. The quotation is part of Hsü's eulogy to the Brownings; see CW, VI, p. 327.

27. Pien K'un-kang is supposed to be the collective work of both Hsü and his wife, but I suspect that Lu Hsiao-man's contribution, if any, must have been very small. Liu Hsin-huang reported that Lu at least published a short story; see Liu, Lu Hsiao-man hsüan-chi, pp. 87-117, 184. Incidentally, Liu's volume is mainly a collection of Lu's diary, prefaces to Hsü's works, etc.; all are included in CW except the short story mentioned above.

28. See CW, I, p. 668; III, p. 639; IV, p. 528; Liang Shih-ch'iu, T'an Hsü Chih-mo , pp. 15 f.

29. The two quotations are from CW, IV, pp. 525, 521 respectively.

30. See CW, I, pp. 635, 650.

31. For Hsü's income see Liang Shih-ch'iu, op. cit. p. 14. It should be noted that a thousand Chinese dollars was a great sum at that time; Wen I-to when working as professor and dean of the College of Arts at Ts'ing-tao University earned only about $400 a month. An average professor's monthly salary was about $300 - $500. A woman worker at one of the factories belonging to Hsü's father working 11½ hours a day and 28 days a month could get only about $14 a month! In terms of sterling then, Hsü's monthly income was nearly £100, a very enviable sum even in Great Britain. For the above information see the following: Liang Shih-ch'iu, T'an Wen I-to, p. 99; Hsü Chih-mo, "Nan hsing tsa chi"; CW, VI, p. 387. For Hsü's practising economy himself see Liang Shih-ch'iu, T'an Hsü Chih-mo, p. 14; CW, I, p. 400.

32. See Liu Hsin-huang, op. cit. p. 182; Chang Chih-ku, op. cit. pp. 418 f. For the quotation "merry widow" see CW, I, p. 402.

33. See this chapter pp. 292-294.

34. Quotation from Phing Hsin's letter to Liang Shih-ch'iu in Liang, "I Ping Hsin", p. 13. Ping Hsin's letter gives the impression that Hsü knew her fairly well. Chi Lin even claimed that Hsü once "pursued" Ping Hsin (see his book Chung-kuo tso-chia chien-ying, p. 52). The expression "My heart and all my organs etc." is a literal translation; a more idiomatic expression would be "My inner being etc."

35. Carl J. Weber, Hardy's Love Poems, p. 48.

36. See CW, II, pp. 342, 346 f.

37. CW, II, pp. 346 f.

38. CW, II, p. 346.

39. See this chapter, pp. 292 f.

40. CW, II, p. 347.

41. See CW, I, p. 622.

42. See CW, I, p. 628.

43. Hsü's letter to Elmhirst dated 1st Apr. 1927.

44. See CW, IV, p. 530.

45. Yeh was educated in America, England and France. After teaching for some years, he later became a high-ranking official in the diplomatic service of the Nationalist government beginning in the 1940's. He is now retired in Taiwan.

46. See Liang Shih-ch'iu, Ch'iu-shih tsa-i, pp. 67 f.

47. These editors' names can be seen from the early issues of the magazine. According to Liang Shih-ch'iu, there were only five editors (see Liang, ibid. p. 68); evidently his memory was at fault. Amitendranath Tagore asserted without supporting evidence that the

magazine was "alternatively edited by Hsü Chih-mo, Wen I-to and Jao Meng-k'an." See his Literary Debates in Modern China, 1918-1937, p. 67.
P'an Kuang-tan, educated in China and America, is a eugenist.

48. The dates of publication printed in the magazine can be deceptive in some cases, especially after 1929. Some articles, as far as the dates of writing inserted by their authors are concerned, did suggest that they were written not before but after they were published! This strange matter was due to the occasional postponement of publication of the magazine which, however, still bore the date on which it was supposed to have been off the press.

49. Amitendranath Tagore doubted the accuracy of Hsü's classification of the literary trends and complained that Hsü failed to label himself and the other Crescent Moon people. This criticism is hardly to the point since what Hsü labelled were those against his principle of "health and dignity"; see A. Tagore, op. cit. pp. 68 f.

50. Yeh Kung-ch'ao admitted that at least he and Hu Shih held opposite views on literature and often argued; see Yeh, "Shen-yeh huai yu", p. 61. See also Liang Shih-ch'iu, op. cit. p. 69.

51. CW, VI, p. 324.

52. See this chapter p. 305.

53. The article was published originally in Ch'uang-tsao yüeh-k'an, I:12, 1928, pp. 1-9, and can be seen in many other books dealing with source materials of modern Chinese literature. It has a sub-title, viz. " 'Hsin-yüeh ti t'ai-tu' ti p'i-p'ing" ('新月的態度' 的批評) (A Critique on 'The Attitude of the Crescent Moon'). Li Ho-lin in his Chin erh-shih nien Chung-kuo wen-i szu-ch'ao lun, p. 230, gives only the sub-title without the title, which is very misleading. And whether P'eng K'ang is an individual or just the pen-name of a group of men representing the Creation Society's leftist ideas is a question yet to be answered.

54. Liang's essays concerning this "war" can be seen in the successive issues of the Crescent Moon Monthly

(volume II) published in 1929; his P'ien-chien chi also contains many of those essays. Lu Hsün's criticism of Liang can be seen in a number of essays in San hsien chi (三閒集) (Three Kinds of leisure) and Erh hsin chi (二心集) (Two Hearts).

55. "Kuan-yin hua" (觀音花)(Bodhisattva flowers) was published in the Crescent Moon Monthly, II;1, 1929, pp. 1-10.

56. "Chao X-kuang shih" (照X光室) (X Ray Room) was published in the Crescent Moon Monthly, II:2, 1929, pp. 1-8.

57. Hsü's letter to Li Ch'i dated 21st July, [1929].

58. Ibid.

59. Ibid.

60. See this chapter, p. 310.

61. The two quotations are from Genesis 1:3 and the last line of Shelley's "Ode to the West Wind" respectively.

62. Lo Lung-chi, educated in China, America and England, was professor of political science. He later became active in politics and was opposed to the Kuomintang. After 1949, he held government offices in the People's Republic of China. Lo, however, was not a founder of the Crescent Moon Monthly as recorded in Howard L. Boorman (ed.), Biographical Dictionary of Republican China, III, p. 410.

63. See Lo Lung-chi, "Wo ti pei pu ti ching-kuo yü fan-kan", pp. 1-17; Liang Shih-ch'iu, Ch'iu-shih tsa-i, p. 72.

64. See for instance CW, VI, pp. 103-106.

65. Cf. note No. 145 of this chapter.

66. See especially those letters dated 1st Apr. 1927; 20th July, 1928; 5th Mar. 1929.

67. The political and social condemnation contained in Hsü's letter to Elmhirst was all directed at communists and their fellow travellers but not to the Nationalists.

68. The quotations are from Jerome B. Grieder, Hu Shih and the Chinese Renaissance, p. 225, and Constantine Tung, op. cit. p. 225 respectively.

69. Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai, Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai wen-chi, II, p. 343.

70. See for instance Y. C. Wang, Chinese Intellectuals and the West, 1872-1949, p. 52.

71. Liang Shih-ch'iu, op. cit. p. 65.

72. Liang Shih-ch'iu, T'an Hsü Chih-mo, p. 29.

73. Constantine Tung wrote with some insight about the Crescent Moon Monthly's check on the progress of the proletarian literary movement in China; and his opposite view to Průšek's is basically sound though his claim that everything the Crescent Moon people did was "in search of order and form" and that their attitude towards the Kuomintang was "basically friendly" are debatable questions; see Tung, op. cit. pp. 6, 167, 170, 239 f.

74. See for instance Wang Yao, Chung-kuo hsin wen-hsüeh shih kao, p. 158; Li Ho-lin, Kuan-yü Chung-kuo hsien-tai wen-hsüeh, p. 72.

75. Information from Yeh Kung-ch'ao whom I interviewed in Feb. 1971.

76. See above note No. 75.

77. For instance see Li Ho-lin, op. cit. p. 52; Ting Yi, A Short History of Modern Chinese Literature, [new version, published in Port Washington, 1970], p. 49; Chi Lin, Tso-chia ti sheng-huo, p. 33.

78. Ts'ao Chü-jen, Wen-t'an wu-shih nien hsü-chi, p. 28.

79. Liang Shih-ch'iu, T'an Hsü Chih-mo, p. 29.

80. The publication was Hsü's poem "Kuei-kuo tsa-t'i (1)" (歸國雜題(一)) (Miscellaneous Pieces on My Way Home (1)); see CW, VI, pp. 9-13.

81. See CW, IV, p. 501.

82. See for instance Hsü's letter to Elmhirst dated 5th Jan. 1927; Hu Shih, Hu Shih shih-hsüan, p. 118.

83. See Hu Shih, Hu Shih wen-ts'un, II, p. 527.

84. Quotations from Yeh Kung-ch'ao, op. cit. p. 62.

85. See for instance CW, I, 117; IV, 502 f., 527; Hu Shih's poem written on his mother's death in Hu Shih shih-hsüan, p. 68. Actually other modern Chinese writers like Lu Hsün, Kuo Mo-jo, Yü Ta-fu et al cherished the same feeling towards filial piety.

86. See Hu Shih's essay in CW, I, pp. 355-368.

87. A person referred to as "hsien-sheng" (先生) (sir) in Hsü and Lu Hsiao-man's diaries seemed to be Hu Shih, who supported, encouraged and helped her and Hsü during their struggle for marriage freedom; see CW, IV, pp. 300 f., 309, 316, 328, 335, 401.

88. See L. K. Elmhirst's note to his wife filed together with the draft of his letter to Hsü dated 4th Feb. 1927.

89. See Hu Shih's letter to L. K. Elmhirst dated 26th Dec. 1926.

90. See chapter 3, p. 197.

91. See chapter 3, p. 197.

92. For Hu Shih's possession of some of Hsü's private papers see CW, I, p. 21; VI, pp. 247-250.

93. See CW, VI, p. 438. From here it is clear that the reason why most of Hsü's letters to Hu Shih remain unpublished is presumably that they involve too many living people. I feel pretty sure that all these letters, with other private papers perhaps, will see the light when Hu Shih's complete diary is published in the future. I was told by Prof. Liang Shih-ch'iu in an interview that Mrs. Hu Shih keeps all these "treasures" and she, acting on her husband's will, grants nobody access to them.

94. That particular poem is in fact more closely connected with Mrs. Browning. Hsü seemed to have made free adaptation of her life story and turned it into a tragedy; see CW, I, p. 101.

95. See CW, I, pp. 661 f.

96. See CW, I, pp. 355-368.

97. For both remarks see CW, I, p. 32.

98. See chapter 2, pp. 80, 82.

99. See chapter 2, p. 89.

100. See Liang Shih-ch'iu, Wen-hsüeh yin-yüan, pp. 59 f.

101. See Liang Shih-ch'iu, "Hsien-tai Chung-kuo wen-hsüeh chih lang-man ti ch'ü-shih". It must be noted that Liang already had his writing published in CPFK at an earlier date as a "preface" to Hsiung Fo-hsi, "Ch'ang-ch'eng chih shen", but since that is included as part of Hsiung's work, it is better not to count it as Liang's first independent contribution during Hsü's tenure of office.

102. Liang's later essays are: "Wen-hsüeh p'i-p'ing pien"; "Yü tzu-jan t'ung-hua"; "Ut Pictura Poesis". The last one was later given a Chinese title "Shih yü t'u-hua" (詩與圖畫) in Liang, Ku-tien ti yü lang-man ti.

103. See this chapter, pp. 292 f.

104. See Liang Shih-ch'iu, T'an Hsü Chih-mo, p. 29.

105. See ibid. pp. 33-37.

106. This was what Liang told me in an interview in Feb. 1971. He meant that without romantics like Hsü the world would be too dull, but a large number of them would upset the good balance of human relations.

107. See Liang's letter to me dated 4th June, 1972.

108. Shen Ts'ung-wen, novelist and story writer, is too well known to need details. Chao Ching-shen and Ho Chia-huai are also prose writers. As for Ch'en Meng-chia, he did not appear to continue writing poetry after the late thirties. Turning to research in archeology, he later became a famous scholar in his specialized field. Both Shen and Ch'en were subjected to harsh criticism in China after 1949 for their past association with the Crescent Moon people and activities, and their lukewarm attitude to the new regime.

109. See Liang Shih-ch'iu, T'an Hsü Chih-mo, p. 2.

110. See CW, I, pp. 427-434, 415-426.

111. Quotations are from Hu Shih; see CW, I, p. 365.

112. Hu Yeh-p'in was only a mediocre writer who began his career as a "poet" imitating Li Chin-fa in the mid-twenties. He has been praised in mainland China for his "correct" ideology expressed in his later works and above all, for his martyrdom. Ting Ling, who later joined the Chinese communist party, enjoyed international fame as a Stalin literary prize winner.

113. K'e Ch'uan reported how Hu Yeh-p'in and others started their literary career through contributing to CPFK in his article "Shih-nien lai ti Chung-kuo wen-t'an", p. 156.

114. See Shen Ts'ung-wen, Chi Ting Ling hsü-chi, pp. 44 f., 47, 53-62.

115. See ibid, pp. 47, 53, 125.

116. See for instance Hsü's own poem "Ting-tang ch'ing-hsin" (丁當清新) (Ting-tang, A Clear Sound of Breaking).

117. See Shen Ts'ung-wen, op. cit. See also Shao Hsün-mei, "Hsü Chih-mo ti 'Tang nü-shih' ", p. 217.

118. See [L. K. Elmhirst (ed.)], Rabindranath Tagore, Pioneer in Education, p. 101. This volume was actually edited by L. K. Elmhirst, but most libraries have it under the name Tagore in the authors' catalogue. See also Sudhir Sen, Rabindranath Tagore on Rural Reconstruction, p. 104.

119. Quotation from Hsü's letter to Elmhirst dated 10th July, 1925.

120. Hsü's letter to L. K. Elmhirst dated 13th July, 1925.

121. Hsü's letter to L. K. Elmhirst dated 5th Jan. 1927.

122. See Hsü's letter to L. K. Elmhirst dated 5th Jan. 1927.

123. See note No. 88 of this chapter.

124. Quotation from Hsü's letter to L. K. Elmhirst dated 5th Jan. 1927.

125. See Hsü's letter to L. K. Elmhirst dated 1st Apr. 1927.

126. CW, I, p. 641 states that Hsü took his leave in Autumn, visiting India first and then England. This misinformation is evidently from Ch'en Ts'ung-chou, op. cit. p. 76. As to the fact that he visited New York before going to England, see his letter to Elmhirst from New York dated 20th July, 1928; a telegram despatched from New York dated 24th July, 1928; and another letter to Elmhirst from London dated 11th Aug. 1928.

127. See Hsü's postcard to L. K. Elmhirst dated 11th Aug. 1928 and a letter dated "Friday night", Sept. 1928.

128. See Hsü's letter to Roger Fry dated "Sunday". The letter must have been written in the middle of August, 1928 when Hsü was back in King's College, Cambridge for a brief visit. The letter itself and Hsü's postcard to Elmhirst dated 11th Aug. 1928 contain some background information for it.

129. Hsü's letter to L. K. Elmhirst dated "Saturday, Sept. 1928".

130. See Hsü's letter to L. K. Elmhirst dated "Friday night, from Porthcurno, Sept. 1928".

131. CW, II, p. 382 shows that Hsü was in Singapore on 2nd November; his visit to Santiniketan was reported in "Visva-Bharati Notes and News", in Visva-Bharati Quarterly, VI:3, 1928, p. 372.

132. See L. K. Elmhirst's letter to Hsü dated 10th Sept. 1928 and Hsü's letter to Elmhirst dated 7th Jan. 1929.

133. See Hsü's letter to L. K. Elmhirst dated 7th Jan. 1929.

134. See Hsü's letter to L. K. Elmhirst dated 5th Mar. 1929.

135. See Hsü's letter to L. K. Elmhirst dated 28th June, 1929.

136. See Hsü's letter to L. K. Elmhirst dated "Friday night, from Porthcurno, Sept. 1928".

137. Mr. Elmhirst told me in an interview in June, 1971 that he was utterly puzzled by Hsü's sudden and complete silence.

138. See L. K. Elmhirst's letter to Hsü dated 10th Sept. 1928.

139. The idea about the responsibility of the élite is an Indian tradition for which, with special reference to Tagore, see Sudhir Sen, op. cit. p. 11.

140. In Howard L. Boorman (ed.), op. cit. I, p. 123 this magazine is said to be the first of its kind in China. In fact the first was Shih (詩) (Poetry), edited by Chu Tzu-ch'ing and a couple of friends, and published by Chung Hua Book Co., Shanghai from Jan. 1922 to May, 1923. Incidentally, as far as I know, the three copies of Shih k'an (詩刊) (Poetry Magazine) (Shanghai, 1931, Nos. 1-3 inclusive) kept in the library of the School of Oriental and African Studies, London are the only three that can be found outside China.

141. Shih k'an (Shanghai), No. 1, 1931, pp. 1 f.

142. Ibid. p. 3.

143. Ibid. p. 3.

144. Ibid. pp. 8-11.

145. This must not be construed as Hsü's loss of interest in politics. In a letter to Liang Shih-ch'iu dated 19th Dec. 1930 (CW, I, p. 100) he regretted that Liang in his contribution to the Poetry Magazine (Shanghai) had not included any criticism of proletarian poetry. Hsü never forgot the task of combating communism.

146. See Chow Tse-tsung, The May Fourth Movement, p. 355.

147. Shih k'an (Shanghai), No. 2, 1931, p. 3.

148. Ibid. No. 1, 1931, p. 84.

149. Ibid. No. 1, 1931, p. 86.

150. Ibid. No. 2, 1931, p. 2.

151. But there is no reason why Feng Chih should be counted as a member of the "Crescent Moon School" and its master of the sonnet, as reported in Patricia Guillermaz, La Poésie Chinoise Contemporaire, p. 15.

152. See Hsü Chih-mo, "Ch'ien-yen", pp. 1-3 and "Hsü-yen" pp. 1-4; Liang Shih-ch'iu, "Hsin-shih ti ke-tiao chi

ch'i-t'a", pp. 81-86; Liang Shih-ch'iu, "Lun shih", pp. 104-109.

153. See Hsü Chih-mo, "Hsü-yen", pp. 2 f.

154. See Hsü Chih-mo, "Ch'ien-yen", pp. 1 f. and "Hsü-yen", pp. 1 f. for all the information in this paragraph.

155. Tai Wang-shu, "T'an kuo-fang shih-ko", p. 84.

156. Shao openly declared his admiration for and imitation of Hsü Chih-mo in his article "Hsü Chih-mo ti 'Tang nü-shih' ", p. 217.

157. See Zau Sinmay [Shao Hsün-mei] , "Poetry Chronicle", p. 265.

158. Shao continued "Madam Tang" in Jen-yen chou-k'an from II:11 to II:40, 1931 and still could not bring the story to an end; then he stopped, declaring that he would finish it in book form. It did not seem, however, that he acted on his own words.

159. For the "Ants' Club" see Shao Hsün-mei, "Wen-hua ti pan-ti", pp. 389-391.

160. For instance he edited Jen-yen chou-k'an, Sheng-se hua-pao (聲色畫報) (Sound and Colour Pictorial), and Hsin-shih k'u ; was involved in the promotion of "min-tzu wen-hsüeh" (民族文學) (National literature) and in the editorial work of Lun yü (論語) (Analects) and T'ien-hsia (天下) (The Universe), etc. Being a rich man, he also ran publishing houses in Shanghai.

161. See P'u Feng, "Wu-szu tao hsien-tsai ti Chung-kuo shih-t'an niao-k'an", pp. 56-67.

162. See the advertisement on page 290, Wen-hsüeh (文學), VIII:1, 1937.

163. See for instance T'an Tzu-hao, Lun hsien-tai shih, pp. 174-177.

164. See Ch'en Meng-chia, "T'an Hsü Chih-mo ti shih", pp. 81-87; Pa Jen, "Yeh t'an Hsü Chih-mo ti shih", pp. 81-86; Yin Chin-p'ei, "Pa Jen ti i-chih leng-chien", pp. 41-46.

165. See Tsang K'e-chia, Chung-kuo hsin-shih hsüan, p. 14.

166. See CW, I, pp. 640, 650, 656. According to a letter (dated 1st Dec. 1971) I received from the University of Texas, Austin, Texas, U.S.A., where all the P. E. N. records and documents are housed, the Chinese P. E. N. was formed on 16th November, 1930, not March, 1931 or 1925 as put forth for further verification in CW, I, p. 656.

167. See CW, I, pp. 658 f.

168. The discussion in this section covers Hsü's third and fourth collections, i.e., Meng hu chi (猛虎集) (The Tiger) and Yün yu (雲游) (Wandering in the Clouds). The latter is a very thin volume published posthumously, containing barely ten poems, most of which first appeared in the Poetry Magazine (Shanghai).

169. See CW, II, p. 339.

170. See Ch'en Ts'ung-chou, op. cit. p. 35.

171. Hsü and Lu Hsiao-man started living together by late October, 1925 but were not married till October, 1926. See CW, I, pp. 605, 623; IV, pp. 253 f.

172. See CW, IV, p. 541.

173. See Mao Tun, op. cit. pp. 519, 529-531.

174. See Chang Chün-ku, op. cit. pp. 392 f.

175. See comments on this particular poem in Liang Shih-ch'iu, T'an Hsü Chih-mo, p. 40; Hu Shih, "Chui-tao Chih-mo", in CW, I, p. 363.

176. T. S. Eliot, The Use of Poetry, p. 150.

177. CW, II, p. 339.

178. Ibid.

179. CW, II, p. 347.

180. For the background of the composition of this poem see CW, I, p. 101.

181. See CW, II, p. 404.

182. See CW, II, p. 406.

183. Cyril Birch does not seem to know this sub-title (which is not included in The Tiger) when he says the poem owes no debt to any English poet; see Birch, op. cit. p. 269. Hsü used the pen-name "Hsien ho" (仙鶴) (Fairy Crane) for the publication of this poem in the Crescent Moon Monthly; apparently he was trying to avoid trouble from the left-wing critics.

184. Yeh told me in an interview that he thought highly of Eliot's poetry; see also Yeh Kung-ch'ao, op. cit. p. 61.

185. Liang Shih-ch'iu, op. cit. p. 41

186. See CW, I, p. 433.

187. Mao Tun, op. cit. p. 526.

188. See CW, I, pp. 517 f.

189. CW, II, p. 345.

190. "T'ien-kuo ti hsiao-hsi" (天國的消息) (News from the Heavenly Kingdom), a poem in the first collection, also has fourteen lines, but I do not think it was written as a sonnet.

191. See CW, VI, pp. 337 f.

192. See his preface in the Poetry Magazine (Shanghai), No. 2, 1931, pp. 2-4.

193. See CW, VI, p. 192.

194. For example see Hu Shih, Hu Shih wen-ts'un, II, pp. 515, 520 f.

195. For example see the following: CW, II, pp. 368, 384, 437, 546, etc.

196. CW, II, p. 557.

197. The first quotation is from Ou-yang Hsiu (歐陽修)'s

tz'u (詞) "Tieh lien hua" (蝶戀花) which can be found, in addition to his collected works, in any tz'u anthology covering the Sung (宋) period; the second is from Li Po's "Hsüan-ch'eng tu-chüan-hua" (宣城杜鵑花) (The Rhododendron of Hsüan-ch'eng) which is in chüan (卷) XXIII of his poetical works.

198. See CW, II, pp. 413, 562.

199. I have in mind such names as T'an Tzu-hao (覃子豪), Chung Ting-wen (鍾鼎文), Yü Kuang-chung (余光中), Chi Hsien (紀絃) and others.

200. See Ya Hsien, Shen-yüan, p. 235.

201. From "The Wild Geese".

202. See CW, II, 348 f.

203. Cf. chapter 2, p. 136.

204. See CW, V, p. 115 where Hsü's discussion is based on Lin Pu's lines though the exact words are not put in quotations. For the original poem see Lin Ho-ching shih-chi, chüan (卷) II, p. 26.

Epilogue.

Hsü Chih-mo's love life was an important series of events affecting him and his creative work. Starting from pursuing the facial beauty and talents of a girl, he yearned for the literary achievement to be realized in the union of himself and his "soul's companion". He struggled fiercely and bravely. He underwent a stormy experience that was to have gratified his adventurous soul and fulfilled his romantic dreams. Eventually he succeeded in obtaining, if not his first love, nevertheless a pretty woman; but he did not realize his ideal. His failure was due to a miscalculation which was the product of his own blind passion and over-confidence. An extreme individualist and a believer in emotion, he relied solely on himself for judgement; when he needed guidance, he would listen only to those who supported him. Furthermore, perhaps more importantly, he was not sufficiently aware that in order to attain his goal, his chosen companion should have been one educated to embrace his own vision of her own accord, not just one brought up in the glamour of upper class society. Because of his adoration for the versatility of the great Renaissance figures of Europe, he was led to believe that such a quality was the sure sign of greatness, and indeed he saw greatness in the superficial versatility of Lu Hsiao-man - a mistake he could not afford to make and yet he did make. This caused irrevocable disaster and remorse in his life.

Rightly or wrongly, Hsü was not only a marriage "reformer" in modern China but a political preacher. He was always anxious to make his voice heard, being confident that it represented that of the noble minority - the élite who and only who could bring hope and a promising future

to China. However, whatever lofty gospel he wished to propagate, his audience in this respect was few simply because most of his compatriots, as human beings, could not concern themselves with the idealist's higher things in life when their stomachs were not reasonably full. Secondly, saturated with ideas of the west and western democracy, and hampered by his own bourgeois origin, he had only a meagre knowledge of people outside the privileged upper class; he was not fully conscious that the Chinese, cherishing a long and an old civilization and yet being subjected to foreign invasion and humiliation, could hardly find their peace without gambling with their fate in a revolution aimed at abolishing internal and external exploitations and restoring the dignity of an independent country. While the national psychological trend was veering towards radicalism, Hsü's spiritualistic reformist views could not but be spurned as being ineffectual and even harmful and reactionary. In the political sense, he was, to borrow Arnold's words on Shelley, "beating in the void his luminous wings in vain".

In the realm of letters, Hsü left his ivory tower after becoming editor of the Peking Morning Post late in 1925. Three years later, when he proclaimed that the poet's task was to defend the dignity of thought, to uphold ideals and to expose errors of the world in his elegy "Hardy", he acknowledged the involvement of literature in life. Poetry was to have its mission in society, and the defence of individual freedom was of paramount importance; it followed that communism, the arch-foe of democracy, must be opposed by all means. Although such views were not expressly stated when Hsü published the Poetry Magazine (Shanghai) in 1931, they were nevertheless tangible under the cover of individualism and élitism. They naturally appealed to

those who were politically right or neutral, or who believed like Hsü that universal love could melt the hatred associated with class struggle.

Being one of the avant-garde poets who successfully handled the new poetic medium - pai-hua, Hsü easily won himself a place in the history of modern Chinese literature. But this was not altogether a blessing to him, for on account of his false image as an expert in English literature trained in Cambridge, he had the trouble of bolstering something he did not possess. Truely, he was taken up and fêted too soon for his own good upon his return to China from England; and yet, unlike Wen I-to, he had not the patience to tackle academic work, and did not attempt to make up for his inadequacy by intensive private study or research. He counted on his own natural talents. In those days in China, he could well afford to do that because there were few rivals, especially in the field of poetry.

Hsü was unquestionably endowed with poetic facility; if he had lived longer, he would most probably have written more poetry, and the variety of his poetic experiments would have been even more remarkable; but whether he would have progressed steadily in his art is doubtful. The romantic "spontaneous flow" might have continued to trickle, or occasionally gush with lustre and charm, but it would have been at most a stream in his native Chekiang rather than the part of the Yangtze in Kiangsu.

Hsü Chih-mo's work did have some of the same imaginative power and, in his own words, "mysterious beauty" as that of his classical poetic heroes Li Po and Li Shang-yin (李商隱) respectively, but he could hardly

hope to attain their poetic stature despite the fact that he, more fortunate than most of his poet predecessors, evidently enjoyed tremendous popularity and admiration in his life time. This success was to a certain extent due to his personality. He knew how to win human hearts, except for those of the dedicated communists. His published works naturally had a wide sale not because they were necessarily of a higher quality than others but because they appealed to worshippers and serious verse makers alike by virtue of the charm of his personality and his poetic experiments; in fact they also became somewhat a "must" to his political foes who were only too anxious to know what a clever and talented enemy had to say and how he bred disciples and created legends. Their reading of Hsü's works was to them a political lesson of Marxism in the reverse way.

Needless to say, a glamourous man like Hsü had a considerable number of followers. But it should be noted that Hsü's followers did not in the strict sense strive to write <u>his</u> poetry. It appeared that they admired him for his magnanimity in a period when polemics were almost a weekly, if not daily, phenomenon in the literary circles, and they were following him chiefly in poetic experiments and in promoting poetry and arts. Naturally in the course of "following", there was bound to be some, or something like, imitation, however unconsciously framed.

All Hsü's friends regarded him as a "big child". His childlike character was perhaps half born and half cultivated, since he believed that the child was far more lovable than the man, and that truth and beauty could readily be found in innocence. His character won him scores of friends, but it was the same character that

repelled not a few persons. It would seem that in his early literary career, he was instinctively inclined to appreciate and practise the child's unsophisticatedness more than its proper humility; consequently he bragged and flaunted a good deal, and poured out his feelings and ideas, more often immature than mature, in his talks and writings. He probably thought that all this was the full expression of sincerity, frankness and innocence, and would endear him to others. He was scarcely aware that it might incur displeasure and antagonism from people of different temperaments and political allegiance. In this connection, his personality was almost as much a liability as an asset.

Hsü is particularly remembered as one of the most, if not the most, devoted worshippers of the Muses in China. His zeal in literary activities never ebbed. He himself worked, and stimulated others to work. He was always an animating power in anything that was literary and cultural. Embracing a deep faith in the value of friendship, he could co-operate with almost all sorts of people. Although he was no saint who could forgive offenders as many times as "seventy times seven", or could commit no injustices, he had a larger mind than many other writers in modern China. His attitude towards mankind stemmed from his belief in the virtue of love and kindliness. He saw no reason why our world could not become a paradise if such virtue was earnestly practised. He called himself an idealist, and an idealist he remained.

Apart from extolling "idealism" (or "ideal(s)") and "creative idealism" , Hsü had no sympathy with the classification of literary, artistic or philosophical trends into "schools", and he never professed romanticism in spite of the romanticism manifested in both his life

and works. An "incurable individualist" as he dubbed himself, he seemed to disdain and fear being grouped together with others, and after all, the English romantic poets he praised did not call themselves romantics either. The existence of "isms" to him was the result of systematization which was associated with scientific methods of study. He did not believe in such methods, and this was in perfect consonance with his faith in inspiration, or "spontaneous flow", in creative work.

In terms of poetry, Hsü had Byron's carelessness, but not his grandeur; he possessed some of Shelley's ardour, but not his high flights of imagination; he attained part of Keats's sensuousness, but not his mellowness. So strictly speaking, he was not a Chinese Byron, or Shelley, or Keats, though some people are tempted to call him one, or even two or all three of them. Hsü wrote Hardyan poems, but nobody would be so absurd as to crown him a Chinese Thomas Hardy. He resembled, however, another Kingsman, Rupert Brooke. Both were popular in their day, engaged in poetic experiments (though in Brooke's case this was not really important), had real poetry if not exceptionally brilliant originality in their works, and finally, both died relatively young and were deeply and sincerely mourned by many. But Hsü Chih-mo, being a literary pioneer in the early stage of China's "Renaissance", occupied a much more prominent place in the history of modern Chinese literature than his counterpart in that of English literature. Whether he is, politically, to be assigned to the villains' camp or elevated to the heroes' abode, he is doubtless one of the major literary figures after the May Fourth Movement in China. His influence in the literary and, in the broad sense, cultural circles would have continued to be felt if he had lived longer, but, however keen his sense of politics, he would have been unlikely to have become

a Wen I-to or, in the other extreme, a Yeh Kung-ch'ao in the forties during or after the Pacific war. Like Liang Shih-ch'iu, he would have most probably remained a man of letters even if he had attained a respectable old age. China with her basically totalitarian political system could not have changed a man like Hsü into a permanent government official, though he might have gladly helped in cultural affairs.

Hsü Chih-mo was "religious", but he had no religion. He was "philosophical", but he had little philosophy. In his student days in the west, he had been confronted with a great number of things which were all new to the Chinese. He swallowed many, but digested few. While he repeatedly stressed szu-hsiang (思想) (thought), he was unfortunately not the type of person who could delve deeply and systematically in thought. His contemplation of life and death was not based on any solid learning, philosophical or religious. He knew all this, and confessed that his thought was often drifting in the air, a sort of "wandering in the clouds". This too is a reason for denying him the glory of Parnassus.

Although Hsü's prose is not extensively dealt with in this paper, we may note in passing that Hsü is no mean essayist. He is not free from cloying grandiloquence when he has a sermon to preach, and so his merit is not often found in his writings on serious subjects, but in those on familiar topics. Indeed, his sparkling imagination, his hilarious liveliness, and his animated colloquial expressions are unforgettable. Readers may not always agree with him, but few would hesitate to admit that all his "spontaneous flow" is exhilarating. There was nobody else among modern Chinese writers who could write Hsü's familiar essays. Shao Hsün-mei did try, but could not

succeed. Hsü produced a singularly individualistic style, just as Lu Hsün, Chou Tso-jen and Ping Hsin did.

Hsü's most significant contribution to modern Chinese literature of course lies in poetry. His experiments with poetic forms and language, and his introduction of new images from the west were acknowledged by most critics. No modern Chinese lyrical poet can afford to ignore Hsü when embarking on experiments with new forms and poetic diction. As to Hsü's verses, many of them have been forgotten and might not turn green again in people's memory, but some exquisite lyrics will remain gems in pai-hua poetry. No literary history of this particular branch of study is complete without mention of him as an experimenter, a poet and an essayist. His untimely death was a loss to modern Chinese literature, and in some measure at least, also to world literature, since he was after all a bridge between the east and the west in various ways.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

ABBREVIATIONS

CCWH = Chuan-chi wen-hsüeh (傳記文學) (Biographical Literature), Taipei.

CPFK = Ch'en-pao fu-k'an (晨報副刊) (Supplement to the Peking Morning Post), Peking.

HSYP = Hsiao-shuo yüeh-pao (小說月報) (Short Story Monthly), Shanghai.

YS = Yü-szu (語絲) (Small Talks), Peking.

I. Primary sources.

Chiang Fu-ts'ung (蔣復璁) & Liang Shih-ch'iu (梁實秋) (ed.), Hsü Chih-mo ch'üan-chi (徐志摩全集) (Complete Works of Hsü Chih-mo), Taipei, 1969, 6 vols.

Hsü Chih-mo (徐志摩), "An-szu-t'an hsiang-tui chu-i" (安斯坦相對主義) (Einstein's Theory of Relativity), in Kai-tsao (改造) (The Reconstruction), III:8, 1921, pp. 49-64.

_____, "Art and Life", in Ch'uang-tsao chi-k'an (創造季刊) (Creation Quarterly), I:2, 1922, pp. 1-15.

_____, "Ch'ien-yen" (前言) (Preface), in Shih-k'an (詩刊) (Poetry Magazine) (Shanghai), No. 2, 1931, pp. 1-3.

_____, Chih-mo ti shih (志摩的詩) (Chih-mo's Poems), Shanghai, 1925.

_____, "Ch'ou yu ch'ih pai ti ch'ou yu ch'ih pai" (仇友赤白的仇友赤白) (The Enemy, Friend, Red and White of the Enemy, Friend, Red and White), in CPFK, 22nd Oct. 1925.

[Hsü Chih-mo (徐志摩)], "Chüan t'ou yü" (卷頭語) (Preface), in Ch'en-pao ch'i chou chi-nien tseng k'an (晨報七週紀念增刊) (Additional Supplement in Commemoration of the 7th Anniversary of the Peking Morning Post) Dec. 1925.

Hsü Chih-mo (徐志摩) (tr.), "Fei Lai Feng" (飛來峰) (The Peak of Fei Lai), in Ching-pao fu-k'an (京報副刊) (Peking Daily), 1st Mar. 1925.

_____, "Hsiao hua-lan" (小花籃) (A Little Flower Basket), in CPFK, 23rd Mar. 1923.

_____, "Hsiao-po-na ti ke-yen" (蕭伯納的格言) (Bernard Shaw's Epigrams), in CPFK, 1st and 6th Apr. 1925.

_____, " 'Hsien-hua' yin ch'u lai ti hsien-hua" ('閒話'引出來的閒話) ('Causeries' Derived from Causeries), in CPFK, 13th Jan. 1926.

_____, "Hsü-yen" (敘言) (Preface), in Shih-k'an (詩刊) (Poetry Magazine) (Shanghai), No. 3, 1931, pp. 1-4.

_____, "Huan-hsiang" (幻想) (Fantasy), in HSYP, XIV:9, 1923, p. 6.

_____, "I-feng ch'ing-shu" (一封情書), (A Love Letter), in CPFK, 6th Feb. 1926.

_____, "I-ta-li t'ien-shih hsiao-yin" (意大利天時小引) (A Brief Introduction to Italy's Weather), in CPFK, 19th Aug. 1925.

_____, "K'ai-hen-szu" (開痕司) (Keynes), in CPFK, 8th July, 1923.

_____ (tr.), "Kao-pieh tz'u" (告別辭) (A Farewell Speech), in HSYP, XV:8, 1924, pp. 1-4.

_____, "Kei mu-ch'in" (給母親) (To Mother), in CPFK, 31st Aug. 1924.

_____, "Kuan-yü hsia-mien i-shu t'ung-hsin kao tu-che men" (關於下面一束通信告讀者們) (A Message to Readers in Regard to the Following Batch of Letters), in CPFK, 30th Jan. 1926.

_____, "Kuan-yü tang-hua chiao-yü ti t'ao-lun" (關於黨化教育的討論) (Concerning the Discussion of Education by Indoctrination by A Political Party), in CPFK, 20th Sept. 1926.

_____, "Liang-ko shih-chieh ti lao-t'ou-erh ti lai-hsin" (兩個世界的老頭兒的來信) (Letters from Two Old Fellows of the World), CPFK, 24th Nov. 1924.

_____, "Liang-wei shih-chieh ti lao-t'ou lai-hsin" (兩位世界的老頭來信) (Letters from Two Old Fellows of the World), in CPFK, 26th Nov. 1924.

_____, "Lo Su yu-O-chi shu-hou" (羅素遊俄記書後) (A Postscript to Russell's The Theory and Practice of Bolshevism), in Kai-tsao (改造) (The Reconstruction), III:10, 1921, pp. 51-54.

_____, "Lo Su yü Chung-kuo" (羅素與中國) (Russell and China), in CPFK, 3rd Dec. 1922.

_____, Lo-yeh (落葉) (Fallen Leaves), Shanghai, 1932 (4th impression).

_____, "Na-hui pa, lao-chia, hsien-sheng" (拿回吧,勞駕,先生) (Please Take It Back, Sir), in CPFK, 3rd June, 1926.

_____, "Nan-hsing tsa-chi" (南行雜紀) (Random Notes on My Journey to the South), in CPFK, 23rd Aug. 1926.

_____, "O yu man-lu —ti-i han kei Hsin-yüeh—" (歐游漫錄—第一函給新月—) (Random Notes on My European Journey—First Letter to the Crescent Moon [Society]), in CPFK, 2nd Apr. 1925.

_____, "P'ing Wei-erh-szu yu O chi" (評韋爾斯遊俄記) (A Critique on H. G. Wells' Russia in the Shadows), in Kai-tsao (改造) (The Reconstruction), III:10, 1921, pp. 55-58.

_____, "Shih chü" (詩句) (Lines), in Ch'en-pao ch'i-chou chi-nien tseng-k'an (晨報七週紀念增刊) (Additional Supplement in Commemoration of the 7th Anniversary of the Peking Morning Post), 25th Sept. 1926, 7th impression .

_____(tr.), "Ta-pan nü-tzu huan-ying hui" (大阪女子歡迎會) (The Women's Welcome Party in Osaka), in CPFK, 15th Mar. 1925.

_____, "T'ai-ko-erh" (太戈爾) (Tagore), in CPFK, 19th May, 1924.

_____, "T'ai-ku-erh chui-chin hsiao-hsi" (泰谷爾最近消息) (The Latest News about Tagore), in CPFK, 19th Apr. 1924.

_____, "Tan-nung-hsüeh-wu" (丹農雪鳥) (D'Annunzio), in CPFK, 11th May, 1925.

_____, "Tan-nung-hsüeh-wu ti ch'ing-nien ch'i" (丹農雪鳥的青年期) (D'Annunzio's Youth), in CPFK, 13th May, 1925.

_____, "Tan-nung-hsüeh-wu ti hsiao-shuo" (丹農雪鳥的小說) (D'Annunzio's Novels), in CPFK, 19th and 22nd May, 1925.

_____, "The Status of Women in China", unpublished M.A. thesis, Columbia University, 1920.

_____ (tr.), "Ti i tz'u ti t'an-hua" (第一次的談話) (The First Talk), in HSYP, XV:8, 1924, pp. 6-8.

_____, "T'ien-hsia pen wu-shih" (天下本無事) (The World in Fact Has No Trouble), in CPFK, 10th June, 1923.

_____, "T'o-erh-szu-t'ai lun chü i-chieh" (托爾斯泰論劇一節) (Notes on Tolstoy's Observations on Drama), in CPFK, 16th Sept. 1926.

_____ (tr.), "Tsai i-chia fan-tien li" (在一家飯店裏) (In the Restaurant), in YS, No. 17, 1925, p. 5.

_____, "Tsai t'ien chi-chü hsien-hua ti hsien-hua ch'eng-pien wang-hsiang chieh-wei" (再添幾句閒話的閒話乘便妄想解圍) (Adding Some More Causeries of Causeries with a Vain Hope to Raise the Siege), in CPFK, 20th Jan. 1926.

_____, "Wo wei-shen-mo lai pan wo hsiang chen-mo-pan" (我為甚麼來辦我想怎麼辦) (Why I've Come to Do It and How I'd Like to Do It), in CPFK, 1st Oct. 1925.

_____, "Yeh" (夜) (Night), in CPFK, 1st Dec. 1923.

_____, "Yin-tu yang shang ti ch'iu-szu" (印度洋上的秋思) (Autumal Thought on the Indian Ocean), in CPFK, 29th Dec. 1922.

_____, "Yu ts'ung Su-o hui chiang tao fu-k'an" (又從蘇俄回講到副刊) (A Talk Starting from Soviet Russia and Now Back to the Supplement), in CPFK, 10th Oct. 1925.

_____ and Chou Tso-jen (周作人), "Chou Tso-jen hsien-sheng lai-han fu fu" (周作人先生來函附復) (Mr. Chou Tso-jen's Letter and My Answer), in CPFK, 21st Dec. 1925.

_____ and Lu Hsiao-man (陸小曼), Pien K'un-kang (卞昆岡) (Pien K'un-kang), Shanghai, 1928.

Unpublished letters of Hsü Chih-mo kept by the following respectively: Mr. L. K. Elmhirst, Mrs. Pamela Diamand, Prof. Li Ch'i, Mrs. Alison Waley, McMaster University and Visva-Bharati University.

Unpublished records of Hsü Chih-mo kept in the following institutions respectively: Clark University, Columbia University, London School of Economics and Political Science and King's College, Cambridge.

CPFK, 1923-1926.

HSYP, vols. XXIV-XXVI, 1923-1925.

Hsin-yüeh yüeh-k'an (新 月 月 刊) (Crescent Moon Monthly), vols. I-IV, 1928-1933.

Shih-k'an (詩 刊) (Poetry Magazine) (Shanghai), Nos. 1-3, 1931.

II. Secondary sources.

A. Works in Chinese.

Chang Chün-ku (章君穀), Hsü Chih-mo chuan (徐志摩傳) (A Biography of Hsü Chih-mo), Taipei, 1970.

Chang Chün-mai (張君勱), "Jen-sheng kuan lun-chan chih hui-ku" (人生觀論戰之回顧) (The Controversy over the Philosophy of Life in Retrospect), in Tung-fang tsa-chih (東方雜誌) (The Eastern Miscellany), XXXI:13, 1934, pp. 5-13.

_____, "Jen-sheng kuan lun-chan chih hui-ku" (人生觀論戰之回顧) (The Controversy over the Philosophy of Life in Retrospect), in Jen-sheng (人生) (Life), No. 313, 1963, pp. 1-6 and 18.

Chang Hsi-jo (張奚若), "Su-o chiu-ching shih pu-shih wo-men ti p'eng-yu" (蘇俄究竟是不是我們的朋友) (Is Soviet Russia Really Our Friend), in CPFK, 8th Oct. 1925.

[Chang] Hsi-jo ([張]奚若), "Lien O yu fan-tui kung-ch'an" (聯俄與反對共產) (Uniting Russia and Opposing Communism), in CPFK, 22nd Oct. 1925.

Chang Pi-lai, (張畢來), Hsin wen-hsüeh shih kang (新文學史綱) (An Outline History of Modern Chinese Literature), Peking, 1955.

Chao Ch'i (趙畸) et al, "Pei-ching i-shu chü-yüan chi-hua ta-kang" (北京藝術劇院計劃大綱) (An Outline Plan of the Peking School of Fine Arts and Drama), in CPFK, 16th, 23rd Sept. 1926.

Chao Chia-pi (趙家璧) (ed.), Chung-kuo hsin wen-hsüeh ta-hsi (中國新文學大系) (Compendium of Modern Chinese Literature), Shanghai, 1936, 3rd impression, 10 vols.

Chao Ching-shen (趙景深), Wen-jen chien-ying (文人剪影) (Profiles of Some Literary People), Shanghai, 1936.

Chao Ts'ung, (趙聰), Sa nien tai wen-t'an tien-chiang lu (廿年代文壇點將錄) (A List of the Prominent Men of Letters in the Thirties), Hong Kong, 1970.

Ch'en Ch'i-hsiu (陳啟修), "Ti-kuo chu-i yu pai-se ho ch'ih-se chih pieh ma" (帝國主義有白色和赤色之別嗎) (Is There Any Differentiation in Imperialism by the Colours of White and Red), in She-hui chou-k'an (社會週刊) (Social Weekly) of Pei-ching ch'en-pao (北京晨報) (Peking Morning Post), 6th Oct. 1925.

Ch'en Hsi-ying (陳西瀅), "Kuan-yü Hsin-yüeh she" (關於新月社) (Concerning the Crescent Moon Society), in CCWH, XVIII:4, 1971, pp. 23-25.

[Ch'en] Hsi-ying ([陳] 西瀅), Hsi-ying hsien-hua (西瀅閒話) (Causeries of Hsi-ying), Shanghai, 1928.

Ch'en Hsiang-ho (陳翔鶴), "Kuan-yü Ch'en-chung she ti kuo-ch'ü hsien-tsai chi chiang-lai" (關於沉鐘社的過去現在及將來) (The Past, Present and Future of the Sunken Bell Society), in Chao Chia-pi (ed.), Chung-kuo hsin wen-hsüeh ta-hsi (中國新文學大系) (Compendium of Modern Chinese Literature), Shanghai, 1936, 3rd impression, vol. X, pp. 193-201.

Ch'en Meng-chia (陳夢家), "T'an-t'an Hsü Chih-mo ti shih" (談談徐志摩的詩) (Some Observations on Hsü Chih-mo's verse), in Shih-k'an (詩刊) (Poetry Magazine)(People's Republic), No. 2, 1957, pp. 81-87.

Ch'en Ts'ung-chou (陳從周), Hsü Chih-mo nien-p'u (徐志摩年譜) (A Chronological Biography of Hsü Chih-mo), Shanghai, 1949.

Cheng Hsüeh-chia (鄭學稼), Yu wen-hsüeh ke-ming tao ke wen-hsüeh ti ming (由文學革命到革文學的命) (From Literary Revolution to the Execution of Literature), Hong Kong, 1970.

[Ch'eng Fang-wu (成仿吾) (comp.)], "T'ung-hsin erh tse" (通信二則) (Two Letters), in Ch'uang-tsao chou-pao (創造周報) (Creation Weekly), No. 13, 1923, pp. 13-16.

_____, "T'ung-hsin szu tse" (通信四則) (Four Letters), in Ch'uang-tsao chou-pao (創造周報) (Creation Weekly), No. 4, 1923, pp. 13-15.

Chi Che (記者), "T'ai-ko-erh tao hua ti ti-i tz'u chi-shih" (太戈爾到華的第一次記事) (The First Report of Tagore's Arrival in China), in HSYP, XV:4, 1924, pp. 7-16.

Chi Lin (季林), Tso-chia ti sheng-huo (作家的生活) "Writers' Life", Hong Kong, 1965 (?).

_____, Chung-kuo tso-chia chien-ying (中國作家剪影) (Silhouettes of Chinese Writers), Hong Kong, 1958.

Chiang Fu-ts'ung (蔣復璁), "Shih-hu chiu meng chi" (石虎舊夢記) (The Old Dream Around Stone-Tiger Lane), in Tzu-yu t'an (自由談) (Free Talks), XV:5, 1964, pp. 7-9.

Chiang Shao-yüan (江紹原), "I-ko yen-chiu tsung-chao shih ti jen tui-yü T'ai-ko-erh kai tsen-yang hsiang ni" (一個研究宗教史的人對於太戈爾該怎樣想呢) (How Should A Scholar of History of Religions Think Concerning Tagore), in CPFK, 2nd July, 1924.

Chien Hsien-ai (蹇先艾), "Tu liao 'suan-hsüeh yü shih-jen' chih-hou" (讀了'算學與詩人'之後) (After Reading 'Mathematics and Poets'), in CPFK, 12th Aug. 1923.

Ch'ien Hsing-ch'un (錢杏邨), "Chung-kuo hsin-hsing wen-hsüeh lun" (中國新興文學論) (On the Newest Kind of Literature in China), in Wen-i chiang-tso (文藝講座) (Literary Forum), No. 1, 1930, pp. 151-197.

Chien Yu-wen (簡又文), "T'ai-ko-erh chih szu-hsiang pei-ching" (太戈爾之思想背景) (The Background of Tagore's Thought), in CPFK, 13th Apr. 1924.

Chou Jung (周容), "Chih-mo ti shih" (志摩的詩) (Chih-mo's Poems), in CPFK, 17th Oct. 1925.

Chou Tso-jen (周作人), Chou Tso-jen shu-hsin (周作人書柬) (Letters of Chou Tso-jen), Shanghai, 1933.

_____, "Chung-kuo hsi-chü ti san-t'iao lu" (中國戲劇的三條路) (The Three Ways for the Chinese Drama), in Tung-fang tsa-chih (東方雜誌) (The Eastern Miscelleny)(A special Issue in Commemoration of 20th Anniversary), 1924, p. M 4.

_____, I-shu yü sheng-huo (藝術與生活) (Art and Life), Shanghai, 1940.

_____, T'an hu chi (談虎集) (Talks Concerning Tigers), Shanghai, 1948.

_____, Tzu-chi ti yüan-ti (自己的園地) (One's Own Garden), Shanghai, 1929, 12th impression.

_____, Yü-t'ien ti shu (雨天的書) (Essays Written during Rainy Days), Shanghai, 1930, 4th impression.

Chu Hsiang (朱湘), Shih-men chi (石門集) (The Stone Gate), Shanghai, 1934.

_____, "Hsin-shih p'ing" (新詩評) (A Critique on New Poetry), in CPFK, 15th Apr. 1926.

_____, "P'ing Hsü chün 'Chih-mo ti shih' " (評徐君志摩的詩) (A Critique on Mr. Hsü's Chih-mo's Poems), in HSYP, XVII:1, 1926, pp. 1-11.

Chu Tzu-ch'ing (朱自清), Hsin-shih tsa-hua(新詩雜話) (Random Notes on New Poetry), Hong Kong, 1963.

_____, Chu Tzu-ch'ing ch'üan-chi (朱自清全集) (Complete Works of Chu Tzu-ch'ing), Peking, 1953, 4 vols.

Chu Tzu-ch'ing (朱自清) et al (ed.), Wen I-to ch'üan-chi (聞一多全集) (Complete Works of Wen I-to), Shanghai, 1949, 4 vols.

Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai (瞿秋白), Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai wen-chi (瞿秋白文集) (Collected Works of Ch'ü Ch'iu-pai), Peking, 1954, 4 vols.

Ch'üan (泉), "I-ko hsiao-hsiao ti chien-i" (一個小小的建議) (A Humble Suggestion), in CPFK, 11th Jan. 1925.

Fang Lan-ju (方蘭汝), "Wu Yü-seng yü 'Wen-hsüeh fu-k'an' " (吳雨僧與'文學副刊') (Wu Mi and The Literary Supplement), in Shih yü wen (時與文) (Time and Writings), II:7, 1947, p. 23.

Fei Tzu (非子), "Hsü Chih-mo hsien-sheng ti ch'ang-shih" (徐志摩先生的常識) (Mr. Hsü Chih-mo's General Knowledge), in Ching-pao fu-k'an (京報副刊) (Supplement to the Peking Daily), 7th Mar. 1925.

Ho Ch'i-fang (何其芳), "Tsai t'an shih-ko hsing-shih wen-t'i" (再談詩歌形式問題) (More on the Questions of Poetic Forms), in Wen-hsüeh p'ing-lun (文學評論) (Literary Criticism), No. 2, 1959, pp. 55-75.

_____, Wen-hsüeh i-shu ti ch'un-t'ien (文學藝術的春天) (The Spring for Literature and Art), Peking, 1964.

Ho Keng-sheng (郝更生), "Hsin-suan hua liu-mei" (辛酸話留美) (A Student's Grief and Suffering in America), in CCWH, XII:3, 1968, pp. 28-30.

Hsiang-kang wen-hsüeh yen-chiu she (香港文學研究社) (ed. & comp.), Chung-kuo hsin wen-hsüeh ta-hsi hsü-pien (中國新文學大系續編) (Supplement to the Compendium of Modern Chinese Literature) Hong Kong, [1968], 10 vols.

Hsiung Fo-hsi (熊佛西), "Chung-hua hsi-chü kai-chin she ti hsin hsiao-hsi" (中華戲劇改進社的新消息) (The Latest News about the Society for Renovation of Chinese Drama), in CPFK, 21st Apr. 1925.

_____, "Tao Wen I-to hsien-sheng" (悼聞一多先生) (In Memory of Mr. Wen I-to), in Wen-i fu-hsing (文藝復興) (Revival of Literature and Arts), II:1, 1946, pp. 6-9.

_____, "Ch'ang-ch'eng chih shen" (長城之神) (The God of the Great Wall), in CPFK, 22nd Mar. 1926.

Hsü Ch'ih (徐遲), "T'an ke-lü shih" (談格律詩) (On Regulated Verse), in Shih-k'an (詩刊) (Poetry Magazine) (People's Republic), No. 6, 1959, pp. 89-94.

Hsü Kuang-p'ing (許廣平) (ed.), Lu Hsün shu-chien (魯迅書柬) (Lu Hsün's Letters), Shanghai, 1946.

Hu Shih (胡適), "Fan-i chih nan" (翻譯之難) (The Difficulty in Translation), in Hsien-tai p'ing-lun (現代評論) (Contemporary Review), I:1, 1924, pp. 14 f.

_____, Hu Shih shih hsüan (胡適詩選) (A Selection of Hu Shih's Poems), Taipei, 1966.

_____, Hu Shih wen-ts'un (胡適文存) (Collected Works of Hu Shih), Shanghai, 1931, 6 vols.

_____, Pai-hua wen-hsüeh shih (白話文學史) (A History of Vernacular Literature), Taipei, 1970.

_____ and Hsü Chih-mo (徐志摩), "I-ko t'ai-tu chi an-yü" (一個態度及案語) (An Attitude and Comments), in CPFK, 11th Sept. 1926.

Hua Wu (華五), "Ying-kuo ti han-hsüeh chia" (英國的漢學家) (The English Sinologists), in Yü-chou feng (宇宙風) (Cosmic Wind), No. 43, 1937, pp. 322-326.

Huang Jen-ying (黃人影) (ed.), Ch'uang-tsao she lun (創造社論) (On the Creation Society), Shanghai, 1932.

Huang Tsun-sheng (黃尊生), "Chung-kuo wen-t'i chih ou-hua wen-t'i yü yü-t'i wen-t'i" (中國文體之歐化問題與語體問題) (Westernization and Modernization of Chinese Literary Style), in Chu-hai hsüeh-pao (珠海學報) (Chu-hai Journal), No. 2, 1964, pp. 39-64.

Jao Meng-k'an (饒孟侃), "Hsin shih-hua" (新詩話) (New Commentary on Verse), in CPFK, 20th May, 1926.

_____, "Hsin-shih ti yin-chieh" (新詩的音節) (The Rhythm of New Poetry), in CPFK, 22nd Apr. 1926.

_____, "Kan-shang chu-i yü Ch'uang-tsao she" (感傷主義與創造社) (Sentimentalism and the Creation Society), in CPFK, 10th June, 1926.

K'e Ch'uan (克川), "Shih-nien lai Chung-kuo ti wen-t'an" (十年來中國的文壇) (The Chinese Literary Scene in the Past Decade), in Wen-i yüeh-k'an (文藝月刊) (Literary Monthly), I:3, 1930, pp. 153-163.

Ku I-ch'ao (顧一樵), Ku I-ch'ao ch'üan-chi (顧一樵全集) (Complete Works of Ku I-ch'ao), Taipei, 1961, 12 vols.

Kuo Mo-jo (郭沫若), Ch'uang-tsao shih-nien (創造十年) (The Creation Society in Ten Years), Shanghai, 1933, 3rd impression.

_____, "Lun chieh-tsou" (論節奏) (On Rhythm), in Ch'uang-tsao yüeh-k'an (創造月刊) (Creation Monthly), I:1, 1926, pp. 1-7.

_____, Mo-jo shu-hsin chi (沫若書信集) (Letters of Kuo Mo-jo), Shanghai, 1933.

_____, Mo-jo wen-chi (沫若文集) (Collected Works of Kuo Mo-jo), Peking, 1957, 17 vols.

_____, T'ien-ti hsüan huang (天地玄黃) (The Heaven and the Earth in Their Primitive State), Shanghai, 1951.

_____, Wen-i lun chi (文藝論集) (Critical Essays on Literature), Shanghai, 1927, 3rd impression.

_____, Ke-ming ch'un-ch'iu (革命春秋) (Records of Revolution), Shanghai, 1947.

Li Chin-kao (李覲高), "Ching-yang Wu Mi" (涇陽吳宓) (Wu Mi of Ching-yang), in CCWH, IV:4, 1964, pp. 23-25.

Li Ho-lin (李何林), Chin erh-shih nien Chung-kuo wen-i szu-ch'ao lun (近二十年中國文藝思潮論) (The Literary Trends of the Last Twenty Years in China), Shanghai, 1945, 2nd impression.

_____, Kuan-yü Chung-kuo hsien-tai wen-hsüeh (關於中國現代文學) (Concerning Modern Chinese Literature), Shanghai, 1957.

Liang Ch'i-ch'ao (梁啟超), Yin-ping shih chuan chi (飲冰室專集) (Collection of Monographies of Liang Ch'i-ch'ao), Shanghai, 1941.

_____, Liang Jen-kung shih-kao shou-chi (梁任公詩稿手迹) (Liang Ch'i-ch'ao's Draft of Poems in Fascimile), [Taipei], 1967(?).

_____, Yin-ping shih wen-chi (飲冰室文集) (Collected Works of Liang Ch'i-ch'ao), Shanghai, [1932], 16 chüan (卷).

Liang Ching-ch'un (梁敬錞), "Lin Ch'ang-min hsien-sheng chuan" (林長民先生傳) (A Biography of Mr. Lin Ch'ang-min), in CCWH, VII:2, 1965, pp. 3-10.

Liang Shih-ch'iu (梁實秋), Ch'iu-shih tsa-i (秋室雜憶) (My Reminiscences), Taipei, 1969.

_____, "Fan-hsing yü Ch'un-shui" (繁星與春水) (Stars and Spring Water), in Ch'uang-tsao chou-pao (創造周報) (Creation Weekly), No. 12, 1923, pp. 4-9.

_____, "Hsien-tai Chung-kuo wen-hsüeh chih lang-man ch'ü-shih" (現代中國文學之浪漫趨勢) (The Romantic Tendency in Modern Chinese Literature), in CPFK, 25th, 27th, 29th, 31st Mar. 1926.

_____, "Hsin-shih ti ke-tiao chi ch'i-t'a" (新詩的格調及其他) (The Forms and Other Matters of New Poetry), in Shih-k'an (詩刊) (Poetry Magazine) (Shanghai), No. 1, 1931, pp. 81-86.

_____, "Hsü Chih-mo yü Hsin-yüeh" (徐志摩與新月) (Hsü Chih-mo and the Crescent Moon), in Ta-jen (大人) (Great People), No. 19, 1971, pp. 15-21.

_____, "I Ping Hsin" (憶冰心) (Ping Hsin in My Memory), in CCWH, XIII:6, 1968, pp. 9-13.

_____, "Kung-li" (公理) (Justice), in Ta-chiang chi-k'an (大江季刊) (Great River Quarterly), I:1, 1925, pp. 125-132.

_____, Ku-tien ti yü lang-man ti (古典的與浪漫的) (Classicism and Romanticism), Shanghai, 1928.

_____, "P'i-p'a chi ti yen-ch'u" (琵琶記的演出) (The Performance of P'i-p'a chi), in CCWH, XII:6, 1969, pp. 18-20.

_____, P'ien-chien chi (偏見集) (Prejudices), Taipei, 1969.

_____, Shih-ch'iu tsa-wen (實秋雜文) (Miscellaneous Essays of Liang Shih-ch'iu), Taipei, 1970.

_____, T'an Hsü Chih-mo (談徐志摩) (About Hsü Chih-mo), Taipei, 1958.

_____, T'an Wen I-to (談聞一多) (About Wen I-to), Taipei, 1967.

_____, "T'ung-hsin i tse" (通信一則) (Correspondence), in Ch'uang-tsao chou-pao (創造周報) (Creation Weekly), No. 32, 1923, p. 15.

_____, "Ut Pictura Poesis", in CPFK, 15th Nov. 1926.

_____, "Wen-hsüeh p'i-p'ing pien" (文學批評辯) (A Treatise on Literary Criticism), in CPFK, 27th Oct. 1926.

_____, Wen-hsüeh yin-yüan (文學因緣) (Literary Essays), Taipei, 1970.

_____, "Yü tzu-jan t'ung-hua" (與自然同化) (In Assimilation with Nature), in CPFK, 2nd Dec. 1926.

Liang Tsung-tai (梁宗岱) "Lun shih" (論詩) (On Poetry), in Shih-k'an (詩刊) (Poetry Magazine) (Shanghai), No. 2, 1931, pp. 104-129.

Lin Pu (林逋), Lin Ho-ching shih-chi (林和靖詩集) (Poetical Works of Lin Pu), Ch'angsha, 1938.

Lin Yutang (林語堂), "Kei Hsüan-t'ung ti hsin" (給玄同的信) (A Letter to Hsüan-t'ung), in YS, No. 23, 1925, pp. 2-4.

_____, Wu so pu t'an (無所不談) (On Anything), Taipei, 1966.

_____, Yu-t'ang sui-pi (語堂隨筆) (Miscellaneous Writings of Lin Yutang), Taipei, 1967.

Liu Fu (劉復), "Feng-ta Ch'en T'ung-po hsien-sheng" (奉答陳通伯先生) (A Respectful Reply to Mr. Ch'en T'ung-po), in YS, No. 64, 1926, pp. 3-5.

_____, "Hsü Chih-mo hsien-sheng ti erh-to" (徐志摩先生的耳朵) (Mr. Hsü Chih-mo's Ears), in YS, No. 16, 1925, pp. 6 f.

_____, "Ma hsia liao yen ti wen-hsüeh shih chia" (罵瞎了眼的文學史家) (A Reproof to the Blind Literary Historians), in YS, No. 63, 1926, p. 556.

_____, "Pa-li t'ung-hsin" (巴黎通信) (A Letter from Paris), in YS, No. 20, 1925, pp. 1-3.

Liu Hsin-huang (劉心皇) (ed.), Lu Hsiao-man hsüan-chi (陸小曼選集) (Selected Works of Lu Hsiao-man), Taipei, 1969.

Liu Shou-sung (劉綬松), Chung-kuo hsin wen-hsüeh shih ch'u-kao (中國新文學史初稿) (A Preliminary Draft History of Modern Chinese Literature), Peking, 1956.

Lo Lung-chi (羅隆基), "Wo ti pei pu ti ching-kuo yü fan-kan" (我的被捕的經過與反感) (The Story of My Arrest and My Antipathy), in Hsin-yüeh yüeh-k'an (新月月刊) (Crescent Moon Monthly), III:3, 1931, pp. 1-17.

Lu Hsün (魯迅), Lu Hsün san-shih nien chi (魯迅三十年集) (Collected Works of Lu Hsün in His 30th Anniversary), Hong Kong, 1967, 30 vols.

Lu Hsün hsien-sheng chi-nien wei-yüan hui (魯迅先生紀念委員會) (ed.), Lu Hsün Ch'üan-chi (魯迅全集) (Complete Works of Lu Hsün), Shanghai, 1938, 20 vols.

Mai K'e-ang (麥克昂) [Kuo Mo-jo (郭沫若)], "Wen-hsüeh ke-ming chih hui-ku" (文學革命之回顧) (The Literary Revolution in Retrospect), in Wen-i chiang-tso (文藝講座) (Literary Forum), No. 1, 1930, pp. 73-88.

Mao Tun (茅盾), "Hsü Chih-mo lun" (徐志摩論) (On Hsü Chih-mo), in Hsien-tai (現代) (Contemporary Age), II:4, 1933, pp. 518-531.

Mu Mu-t'ien (穆木天), "Hsü Chih-mo lun - t'a ti szu-hsiang yü i-shu", (徐志摩論——他的思想與藝術) (On Hsü Chih-mo - His Thought and Art), in Wen-hsüeh (文學) (literature), III:1, 1934, pp. 13-29.

Pa Jen (巴人), "Yeh t'an Hsü Chih-mo ti shih" (也談徐志摩的詩) (Also Some Observations on Hsü Chih-mo's Verse), in Shih-k'an (詩刊) (Poetry Magazine) (People's Republic), No. 11, 1957, pp. 81-86.

Pei-ching shih-ta chung-wen hsi hsien-tai wen-hsüeh chiao-hsüeh kai-ke hsiao-tsu (北京師大中文系現代文學教學改革小組) (ed.), Chung-kuo hsien-tai wen-hsüeh shih ts'an-k'ao tzu-liao (中國現代文學史參考資料) (Reference Material for the History of Modern Chinese Literature), Peking, 1960.

P'ei P'u-hsien (裴普賢), Shih tz'u ch'ü tieh-chü hsin-shang yen-chiu (詩詞曲疊句欣賞研究) (An Appreciative Study of Duplication in Chinese Poetry, Tz'u and Drama), Taipei, 1969.

P'eng Ch'ao-hsien (彭昭賢), "Lü O hua-ch'iao kuei-kuo tai-piao P'eng Ch'ao-hsien hsien-sheng lai-hsin" (旅俄華僑歸國代表彭昭賢先生來信) (A Letter from Mr. P'eng Ch'ao-hsien, the Returned Representative of Chinese Residents in Russia), in CPFK, 1st Mar. 1926.

P'eng K'ang (彭康), "Shen-mo shih 'chien-k'ang yü ts'un-yen' " (甚麼是'健康與尊嚴') (What Is 'Health and Dignity' ", in Ch'uang-tsao yüeh-k'an (創造月刊) (Creation Monthly), I:12, 1928, pp. 1-9.

Ping Hsin (冰心), Ping Hsin san-wen chi (冰心散文集) (Prose Works of Ping Hsin), Shanghai, 1948.

P'u Feng (蒲風), "Wu-szu tao hsien-tsai ti Chung-kuo shih-t'an niao-k'an" (五四到現在的中國詩壇鳥瞰) (A Bird's Eyeview of Chinese Poetry from the May Fourth Movement Up to the Present Time), in Hung Ch'iu (洪球), Hsien-tai shih-ko lun-wen hsüan (現代詩歌論文選) (Selected Essays on Modern Chinese Poetry), Shanghai, 1936, pp. 14-81.

Shao Hsien (少仙), "Ku-hsiang ti hsien-t'ien" (故鄉的閒天) (Leisure Days in a Village), in YS, IV:35, 1928, pp. 447-466.

Shao Hsün-mei (邵洵美), "Hsü Chih-mo ti 'Tang nü-shih' " (徐志摩的'瑞女士') (Hsü Chin-mo's 'Madam Tang'), in Jen-yen chou-k'an (人言周刊) (Human Words Weekly), II:11, 1935, p. 217.

_____, "Wen-hua ti pan-ti" (文化的班底) (The Core of Culture), in Jen yen chou-k'an (人言周刊) (Human Words Weekly), II:20, 1935, pp. 389-391.

Shen Ts'ung-wen (沈從文), Chi Ting Ling hsü-chi (記丁玲續集) (A Supplement to About Ting Ling), Shanghai, 1939.

Shih Ching (史靖), Wen I-to ti tao-lu (聞一多的道路) (The Path of Wen I-to), Shanghai, 1947, 2nd impression.

Shih Ling (石靈), "Hsin-yüeh shih-p'ai" (新月詩派) (The Crescent Moon School of Poetry), in Wen-hsüeh (文學) (Literature), VIII:1, 1937, pp. 125-137.

Su Hsüeh-lin (蘇雪林), Wen-t'an hua-chiu (文壇話舊) (My Recollection of the Literary People), Taipei, 1967.

_____, Wo lun Lu Hsün (我論魯迅) (My Comments on Lu Hsün), Taipei, 1971.

Sun Pai-kang (孫百剛), "Yü Ta-fu yü Wang Ying-hsia" (郁達夫與王映霞) (Yü Ta-fu and Wang Ying-hsia", in Yü Ta-fu (郁達夫), Yü Ta-fu ch'üan-chi (郁達夫全集) (Complete Works of Yü Ta-fu), Taipei, 1968, 2nd impression, pp. 488-538.

Tai Wang-shu (戴望舒), "T'an kuo-fang shih-ko" (談國防詩歌) (About National Defence Verse), in Hsin Chung-hua (新中華) (New China), V:7, 1937, pp. 84-86.

T'an Tzu-hao (覃子豪), Lun hsien-tai shih (論現代詩) (On Modern Verse), Taipei, 1969.

T'ien Hsin (天心), "Sui-pien t'an-t'an i shih yü tso shih" (隨便談談譯詩與作詩) (A Casual Talk about Translation of Poetry and Writing Poetry), in CPFK, 20th May, 1926.

Ting I (丁毅), "Yu Ta-fu hsüan-chi hsü" (郁達夫選集序) (Preface to Selected Works of Yü Ta-fu), in Yü Ta-fu, Yü Ta-fu hsüan-chi (郁達夫選集) (Selected Works of Yü Ta-fu), Peking, 1954, pp. 224-234.

Ting Wen-chiang (丁文江) (ed.), Liang Jen-kung hsien-sheng nien-p'u ch'ang-pien ch'u-kao (梁任公先生年譜長編初稿) (A Preliminary Draft of a Detailed Chronological Biography of Mr. Liang Ch'i-ch'ao), Taipei, 1959.

Ts'ao Chü-jen (曹聚仁), Wen-t'an wu-shih nien hsü-chi (文壇五十年續集) (A Supplement to Fifty Years of Modern Chinese Literature), Hong Kong, 1955.

Ts'ai I (蔡儀), Chung-kuo hsin wen-hsüeh shih chiang-hua (中國新文學史講話) (Talks on the History of Modern Chinese Literature), Shanghai, 1955.

Tsang K'e-chia (臧克家) (ed. & comp.), Chung-kuo hsin-shih hsüan (中國新詩選) (An Anthology of Chinese New Poetry), Peking, 1957.

_____, "Hai" (海) (Sea), in Wen-i fu-hsing (文藝復興) (Revival of Literature and Arts), III:5, 1947, pp. 536-539.

_____, Mo pu tiao ti ying-hsiang (磨不掉的影像) (Indellible Images), Shanghai, 1947.

Tung Ch'u-p'ing (董楚平), "Ts'ung Wen I-to 'Szu-shui' t'an tao ke-lü shih wen-t'i" (從聞一多'死水'談到格律詩問題) (Remarks Concerning Wen I-to's 'Dead Water' and the Question of Regulated Verse), in Wen-hsüeh p'ing-lun (文學評論) (Literary Criticism), No. 4, 1961, pp. 74-84.

Tung-fang Hsi (東方曦), Ch'iu-ch'uang chi (秋窗集) (The Autumn Window), Shanghai, 1937 (?).

Tung Feng-ming (董鳳鳴), "T'ai-ko-erh chih tsai Nan-ching" (太戈爾之在南京) (Tagore in Nanking), in CPFK, 26th Apr. 1924.

Wang Che-fu (王哲甫), Chung-kuo hsin wen-hsüeh yün-tung shih (中國新文學運動史) (A History of the Movement of Modern Chinese Literature), Peiping, 1933.

Wang Ching-chih (汪靜之), "Tso shih chih tz'u-hsü" (作詩之次序) (The Order of Verse Making), in Ching-pao fu-k'an (京報副刊) (Supplement to the Peking Daily), 31st July, 1925.

Wang K'ang (王康), "Po-hsüeh to-ts'ai ti Wen Yüan-ning ta-shih" (博學多才的温源寧大使) (The Learned and Versatile Ambassador His Excellency Mr. Wen Yüan-ning), in Chung-yang jih-pao (中央日報) (The Central Daily), 15th June, 1968, p. 1.

Wang P'i-chiang (汪辟疆), "Wo so jen-shih ti Hsü Chih-mo" (我所認識的徐志摩) (The Hsü Chih-mo I Know), in Tu-shu tsa-chih (讀書雜誌) (Studies), II:9, 1932, pp. 1-5.

Wang Sen-jan (王森然), Chin-tai erh-shih chia p'ing-chuan (近代二十家評傳) (Critique on Twenty Modern Men of Letters), Peiping, 1934.

Wang T'ung-chao (王統照), P'ien yün chi (片雲集) (A Cloud), Shanghai, 1934.

_____, "Wen hsüeh ti tso-p'in yü tzu-jan" (文學的作品與自然) (Literary Products and Nature), in CPFK, 11th July, 1923.

Wang Yao (王瑤), Chung-kuo hsin wen-hsüeh shih kao (中國新文學史稿) (A Draft History of Modern Chinese Literature), Shanghai, 1953.

Wen I-to (聞一多), "Shih ti ke-lü" (詩的格律) (The Form of Poetry), in CPFK, 13th May, 1926.

Wen Yüan-ning (温源寧) (tr. by Ni Shou-min 倪受民), "Hsü Chih-mo - i-ko ta hai-tzu" (徐志摩——一個大孩子) (Hsü Chih-mo - A Big Child), in I-ching (逸經) (Canon of Leisure), No. 8, 1936, pp. 24 f.

_____, "Wu Mi" (吳宓) (Wu Mi), in I-ching (逸經) (Canon of Leisure), No. 24, 1937, pp. 17 f.

Wu Mi (吳宓), "Hsü Chih-mo yü Hsüeh Lai" (徐志摩與雪萊) (Hsü Chih-mo and Shelley), in Yü-chou feng (宇宙風) (Cosmic Wind), No. 12, 1936, pp. 584-588.

_____, Wu Mi shih-chi (吳宓詩集) (Poetical Works of Wu Mi), Shanghai, 1935.

Ya Hsien (瘂弦), Shen-yüan (深淵) (The Abyss), Taipei, 1970.

Ya-tung t'u-shu-kuan (亞東圖書館) (ed.), K'o-hsüeh yü jen-sheng kuan (科學與人生觀) (Science and the Philosophy of Life), Shanghai, 1923.

Yang Chih-hua (楊之華) (ed.), Wen-t'an shih-liao (文壇史料) (Miscellaneous Sources of the Literary Circles), Shanghai, 1944, 3rd impression.

Yeh Ch'ing (葉青), "Hsü Chih-mo lun" (徐志摩論) (On Hsü Chih-mo), in Shih-chieh wen-hsüeh (世界文學) (World Literature), I:1, 1934, pp. 63-78.

Yeh Kung-ch'ao (葉公超), "Shen-yeh huai yu" (深夜懷友) (Recalling My Friend at Mid-Night), in Hsing-cheng yüan hsin-wen chü (行政院新聞局) (ed.), Hu Shih po-shih ping-shih (胡適博士病逝) (Death of Dr. Hu Shih), Taipei, 1962, pp. 61 f.

Yin Chin-p'ei (殷晉培), "Pa Jen ti i-chih leng-chien" (巴人的一枝冷箭) (Pa Jen's Arrow from An Ambush) in Shih-k'an (詩刊) (Poetry Magazine) (People's Republic), No. 5, 1960, pp. 41-46.

Yü Shang-yüan (余上沅), "I-ko pan p'o ti meng" (一個半破的夢) (A Half Broken Dream), in CPFK, 23rd Sept. 1926.

Yü Ta-fu (郁達夫), Ch'i ling chi (奇零集) (Miscellaneous Writings), Shanghai, 1928.

_____, "Huai szu-shih sui ti Chih-mo" (懷四十歲的志摩) (In Remembrance of Chih-mo at Forty Years of Age), in Yü-chou feng (宇宙風) (Cosmic Wind), No. 8, 1936, pp. 364 f.

_____, "Kuan-yü pien-chi, chieh-shao, i-chi shih-shih teng-teng" (關於編輯,介紹,以及私事等等) (Concerning Editing, Introducing, Personal Affairs, etc.), in Ch'uang-tsao yüeh-k'an (創造月刊) (Creation Monthly), I:6, 1927, pp. 109-112.

_____, Ta-fu jih-chi (達夫日記) (Yü Ta-fu's Diary), Shanghai, 1947.

_____, Ta-fu san-wen chi (達夫散文集) (Prose Works of Yü Ta-fu), Shanghai, 1947.

_____, "Wu shih mang che hsien-t'an" (無事忙者閑談) (Casual Words by A Man Busy for Nothing), in Hsien-tai (現代) (Contemporary Age), III:3, 1933, p. 316.

_____, Yü Ta-fu ch'üan-chi (郁達夫全集) (Complete Works of Yü Ta-fu), Taipei, 1968.

Yüeh La (月拉), "Ts'ung Ha-erh-pin lai ti ch'i-wen ts'an-wen" (從哈爾濱來的奇聞慘聞) (A Strange and Cruel Case from Harbin), in CPFK, 8th Feb. 1926.

B. Works in other languages.

Acton, Harold and Ch'en Shih-hsiang (ed. & tr.), Modern Chinese Poetry, London, 1932.

Akiyoshi Kukio (秋吉久紀夫), "Gendai Chūgoku-shi no hōkō" (現代中国詩の方向) (The Trend of Modern Chinese Poetry), in Chūgoku kankei ronsetsu shiryo hozon-kai (中国関係論説資料保存会) (comp.), Chūgoku kankei ronsetsu shiryo (中国関係論説資料) (Collected Articles on China), Book II, No. 2, 1964, pp. 193-197.

Arberry, A. J., (ed.), The Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám, London, 1954.

Baum, P. F., (ed.), The Centennial Edition of the Works of Sidney Lanier, Baltimore, 1945, vol. II.

Bell, Clive, Old Friends, London, 1956.

Bertuccioli, Giuliano, " 'Una Notte a Firenze' di Hsü Chih-mo" (Hsü Chih-mo's 'A Night in Florence'), in Cina, No. 5, 1959, pp. 99-102.

Birch, Cyril, "English and Chinese Metres in Hsü Chih-mo", in Asia Major, N.S., vol. VIII, 1961, pp. 258-293.

_____, "Hsü Chih-mo's Debt to Thomas Hardy (Abstract)", in Transactions of the International Conference of Orientalists in Japan, Tokyo, 1964, No. IX, pp. 73-77.

Bonham-Carter, Victor, Dartington Hall, the History of An Experiment, London, 1958.

Boorman, Howard L. (ed.), Biographical Dictionary of Republican China, New York, 1967, 4 vols.

Boven, P. Henri van, Histoire de la Littérature Chinoise Moderne, Peiping, 1946.

Bulmer, R. H. and L. P. Wilkinson (comp.), A Register of Admission to King's College, 1918-58, London, 1963.

Carpenter, Edward, Angel's Wings, London, 1899.

Chan Wing-tsit, Religious Trends in Modern China, New York, 1953.

Chao, Jonathan T'ien-en (comp.), A Bibliography of the History of Christianity in China, Waltham, 1970.

Ch'en, Charles K. H, (ed.), A Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary of Chinese Authors, Hanover, 1971.

Cherkassky, L. E. (Черкасский, Л.Е.) (ed. & tr.), Dozhdlivaya Alleya (Дождливая Аллея) (The Wet Path), Moscow, 1969.

Chow Tse-tsung, Research Guide to the May Fourth Movement, Intellectual Revolution in Modern China, 1915-24, Cambridge, Mass., 1963.

_____, The May Fourth Movement, Cambridge, Mass., 1960.

Bary, William T. de et al (comp.), Sources of Chinese Tradition, New York, 1960, vol. II.

Doležalová, Anna (tr. by P. Tkáč), Yü Ta-fu, Specific Traits of His Literary Creation, London, 1971.

Dolezălová-Vlckova, A., "Quelques Remarques sur la Question de l'Auto-description chez Yü Ta-fu", in Asian and African Studies, II, 1966, pp. 56-61.

_____, "Remarks on the Life and Works of Yü Ta-fu up to 1930", in Asian and African Studies, I, 1965, pp. 53-65.

Eliot, T. S., The Use of Poetry, London, 1964.

_____ , On Poetry and Poets , New York, 1968.

Elmhirst, L. K., "Tagore's Practical Plan for Sino-Indian Collaboration" [A mimeographed article] .

_____ , "Some Impressions of China", in Visva-Bharati Quarterly, I:1, 1923, pp. 210-220.

_____ , Faith and Works at Dartington, Totnes, 1937.

[Elmhirst, L. K. (ed.)] , Rabindranath Tagore, Pioneer in Education, London, 1961.

Fairbank, J. K. and K. C. Liu, Modern China: A Bibliographical Guide to Chinese Works, 1898-1937, Cambridge, Mass., 1950.

Feuerwerker, Yi-tsi M., "Tradition and Experiment in Modern Chinese Literature", in Albert Feuerwerker (ed.), Modern China, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1964, pp. 169-183.

Florence, P. Sargant, "The Cambridge Heretics, 1909-1932", in A. J. Ayer (ed.), The Humanist Outlook , London, 1968, pp. 223-240.

Forster, E. M., Goldsworthy Lowes Dickinson, London, 1934.

Fry, Roger, "Art and Life" in Roger Fry, Vision and Design, London, 1920, pp. 1-10.

_____ , "Some Aspects of Chinese Art", in Roger Fry, Transformations, London, 1926, pp. 67-81.

Gálik, Marián, Mao Tun and Modern Chinese Literary Criticism, Wiesbaden, 1969.

Graves, Robert, The Common Asphodel, London, 1949.

Grieder, Jerome B., Hu Shih and the Chinese Renaissance, Cambridge, Mass., 1970.

Guillermaz, Patricia, La Poésie Chinoise Contemporaire, Paris, 1962.

Hardy, Thomas, Collected Poems of Thomas Hardy, London, 1970.

Hay, Stephen N., Asian Ideas of East and West: Tagore and His Critics in Japan, China and India, Cambrdige, Mass., 1970.

Herford, C. H., "Gabriele d'Annunzio", in C. H. Herford, Shakespeare's Treatment of Love and Marriage and Other Essays, London, 1921, pp. 101-143.

Hightower, J. R., Topics in Chinese Literature, Cambridge, Mass., 1950.

Holroyd, Michael, Lytton Strachey and the Bloomsbury Group, Harmondsworth, 1971.

Hsia, C. T., "On the 'Scientific' Study of Modern Chinese Literature", in T'oung Pao, L: 1-3, 1963, pp. 428-474.

_____, A History of Modern Chinese Fiction, New Haven, 1961.

Hsu, Kai-yu (tr. and ed.), Twentieth Century Chinese Poetry, Ithaca, 1970.

Huang Sung-k'ang, Lu Hsün and the New Culture Movement of Modern China, Amsterdam, 1957.

Johnstone, J. K., The Bloomsbury Group, London, 1954.

Keynes, J. Maynard, Two Memoirs, London, 1947.

King's College (comp.), Goldsworthy Lowes Dickinson [No place], 1933.

Kripalani, Krishna, Rabindranath Tagore, London, 1962.

Lee, Leo Ou-fan, "The Romantic Generation: A Study of Modern Chinese Men of Letters", unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, 1970.

Leung, G. K., "The Poetry of Hsü Chih-mo", unpublished M.A. thesis, University of British Columbia, Canada, 1969.

_____, "Hsü Chih-mo and Italy", (to be published in East & West (Rome)).

Levenson, J. R., Liang Ch'i-ch'ao and the Mind of Modern China, Cambridge, Mass., 1953.

Liu, James, J. Y., The Art of Chinese Poetry, London, 1962.

Liu, Wu-chi and Li T'ien-yi, Readings in Contemporary Chinese Literature, New Haven, 1953.

Lynn, Jermyn Chi-hung, Social Life of the Chinese in Peking, 1928.

MacNeice, Louis, Modern Poetry, London, 1938.

McDougall, Bonnie S., The Introduction of Western Literary Theories into Modern China, Tokyo, 1971.

Murry, J. Middleton, "Keats's Thought: A Discovery of Truth", in C. D. Thorpe et al (ed.), The Major English Romantic Poets, Carbondale, 1957, pp. 252-258.

Nag, Kalidas (ed.), Tagore and China, Calcutta, 1945.

Palandri, Angela J., "Contemporary Chinese Poetry from Taiwan", in Tamkang Review, I:2, 1970, pp. 67-88.

Pater, Walter, The Renaissance, New York, 1959.

Payne, Robert (ed.), Contemporary Chinese Poetry, London, 1947.

Priestley, K. E. (ed.), China's Men of Letters of Yesterday and Today, Hong Kong, [no year] .

Průšek, Jaloslav, Three Sketches of Chinese Literature, Prague, 1969.

_____ , "Basic Problems of the History of Modern Chinese Literature and C. T. Hsia, A History of Modern Chinese Fiction", in T'oung Pao, XLIX:4-5, 1961, pp. 357-404.

_____ , "The Importance of Tradition in Chinese Literature", in Archiv Orientalni, 26, 1958, pp. 212-223.

Radhakrishnan, S., The Philosophy of Rabindranath Tagore, Baroda, 1961.

Rogers, Timothy, Rupert Brooke, London, 1971.

Roy, David T., Kuo Mo-jo, the Early Years, Cambridge, Mass., 1971.

Russell, Bertrand, Autobiography of Bertrand Russell, London, 1971, vol. II.

_____, "Leisure and Mechanism", in Dial, vol. 75, 1923, pp. 105-122.

_____, Political Ideals, London, 1963.

_____, Portraits from Memory and Other Essays, London, 1956.

_____, The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism, London, 1969.

Sen, Sudhir, Rabindranath Tagore on Rural Reconstruction, Calcutta, 1943.

Štolzova-Bouškovά, Marcela, "On the Origin of Modern Chinese Prosody: An Analysis of the Prosodic Components in the Words of Ping Hsin (1)", in Archiv Orientalni, 32, 1964, pp. 619-643.

Tagore, Amitendranath, Literary Debates in Modern China, Tokyo [1967].

Taogre, Rabindranath, The Diary of A Westward Voyage, Bombay, 1962.

_____, Fruit Gathering, London, 1927.

_____, Gitanjali, London, 1926.

_____, Stray Birds, New York, 1916.

_____, Collected Poems of Rabindranath Tagore, London, 1967.

[Tagore, Rabindranath] , "Some Pages from the President's Travel Diary", in Visva Bharati Quarterly, II:4. 1925, p. 386.

Tagore, Rabindranath, Talks in China, Calcutta, 1925.

[The Editor] ,"Modern Chinese Poetry", in China News Analysis, No. 466, 3rd May, 1963, p. 5.

[The Editor] , "The Returned Student", in The Chinese Students' Monthly, XVII:6, 1922, pp.493 f.

Ting, Yi, A Short History of Modern Chinese Literature, Peking, 1959.

Tung, Constantine, "The Search for Order and Form: The Crescent Moon Society and the Literary Movement of Modern China, 1928-1933", unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Claremont Graduate School, U.S.A., 1971.

Waley, Arthur, "A Debt to China", in Hsiao Ch'ien (comp.), A Harp with A Thousand Strings, London, 1944, pp. 341-345.

Wang, Y. C., Chinese Intellectuals and the West, Chapel Hill, 1966.

Weber, Carl J., Hardy's Love Poems, London, 1963.

Woolf, Virginia, Roger Fry, London, 1940.

Zau, Sinmay [Shao Hsün-mei] , "Poetry Chronicle", in T'ien Hsia, III:3, 1936, pp. 24-29.

Zbavitel, D., "Rabindranath Tagore in 1913-1930", in Archiv Orientalni, 26, 1958, pp. 366-384.

-END-